

College

Composition and Communication

THE OFFICIAL BULLETIN OF THE CONFERENCE ON
COLLEGE COMPOSITION AND COMMUNICATION

THE LIBRARY OF THE

MAR 14 1955

EDITOR

GEORGE S. WYKOFF, *Purdue University*

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

EDITORIAL BOARD

FRANCIS E. BOWMAN, *Duke University*; GLENN J. CHRISTENSEN, *Lehigh University*;
JANE DALE, *Oregon College of Education*; HOWARD H. DEAN, *Montana*
State College; W. NELSON FRANCIS, *Franklin and Marshall*
College; JAMES B. McMILLAN, *University of Alabama*

Vol. VI	February, 1955	No. 1
CCCC SPRING MEETING.....		3
FORTY YEARS OF COMPOSITION TEACHING— <i>Herbert L. Creek</i>		4
A DISCIPLINE OF THE COMMUNICATION SKILLS— <i>Herbert Hackett</i>		10
A NEW LOOK BY ADMINISTRATORS AT RANK, SALARY, AND TEACHING LOAD— <i>John C. Hodges</i>		15
INTEGRATION OF THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH IN HIGH SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES IN TEXAS— <i>T. F. Mayo</i>		18
NSSC NEWS— <i>Jean Malmstrom</i>		20
HELP FOR THE PROBLEM SPELLER— <i>H. Alan Wycherley</i>		21
ON TEACHING TEACHERS— <i>Ellsworth Barnard</i>		25
COMMUNICATION AS PROBLEM-SOLVING— <i>Erwin R. Steinberg</i>		28
THE PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICE OF THE COMMUNICATION COURSE— <i>Thomas F. Dunn</i>		31
THE IDEA OF THE FRESHMAN COMPOSITION COURSE—A POLEMICAL DISCUSSION— <i>Hermann C. Bowersox</i>		38
CCCC BULLETIN BOARD.....		44
SECRETARY'S REPORT No. 12— <i>George S. Wykoff</i>		46
SECRETARY'S REPORT No. 13— <i>George S. Wykoff</i>		47
SOME OF THE YEAR'S WORK IN COLLEGE COMPOSITION AND COMMUNICATION.....		48
PROPOSED REVISIONS OF THE CCCC CONSTITUTION.....		59

College Composition and Communication is published in February, May, October, and December. Subscription price, \$2.00 per year, single copies, 75c. Entered as second class matter May 7, 1954, at the Post Office at Champaign, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879. Orders and business correspondence should be addressed to J. N. Hook, 704 South Sixth Street, Champaign, Illinois. All other communications should be addressed to George S. Wykoff, University Hall, Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana.

National Council of Teachers of English

Conference on College Composition and Communication

1955 OFFICERS

JEROME W. ARCHER, Chairman
Marquette University

IRWIN GRIGGS, Associate Chairman
Temple University

FRANCIS SHOEMAKER, Assistant Chairman
Teachers College, Columbia University

MRS. GLADYS K. BROWN, Secretary
Little Rock Junior College

J. N. HOOK, Treasurer
704 S. Sixth St., Champaign, Illinois

GEORGE S. WYKOFF, Editor
Purdue University

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Universities

RICHARD S. BEAL, Boston University
CECIL BLUE, Lincoln University (Missouri)
GEORGE P. FAUST, Kentucky
WILLIAM M. GIBSON, New York University
ROBERT M. GORRELL, Nevada
HARRISON HAYFORD, Northwestern
ALBERT R. KITZHABER, Kansas
EDITH E. LAYER, Western Reserve
PHILIP R. WIKELUND, Indiana
J. HOOPER WISE, Florida
KARL YOUNG, Brigham Young

Teachers Colleges

T. A. BARNHART, St. Cloud
JEAN MALMSTROM, Western Michigan
College of Education
L. M. MYERS, Arizona State (Tempe)
RACHEL SALISBURY, Milwaukee
WRIGHT THOMAS, Cortland

Liberal Arts Colleges

WAYNE C. BOOTH, Earlham
HERMANN C. BOWERSOX, Roosevelt
CARL LEFEVRE, Pace
SISTER MIRIAM JOSEPH, C.S.C., St. Mary's
(Indiana)
ALBERT UPTON, Whitlittier
MRS. W. R. VAN GELDER, Howard
MARY W. WHITE, Marshall

Technical Schools

FRED LORCH, Iowa State
HERBERT B. NELSON, Oregon State
ERWIN R. STEINBERG, Carnegie Institute
of Technology
ROBERT E. TUTTLE, General Motors Institute

Junior Colleges

INEZ FROST, Hutchinson
GILBERT D. McEWEN, Pasadena City College
MARGUERITE H. MOREY, Colby Junior
College for Women

420.705

CO

V.6

Star

CCCC Spring Meeting, 1955

Hope you're coming! Again or for the first time!

The time: Thursday, Friday, and Saturday,

MARCH 24, 25, and 26, 1955

Encircle these dates on your calendar now. Registration will begin Thursday morning, March 24, and continue throughout the convention. Executive Committee, with Chairman Jerome Archer presiding, will meet from 9 a.m. to 12 noon, Thursday, March 24. First general session, Thursday afternoon, March 24, starting at 1:30.

The place: Chicago, Illinois. Hotel Morrison. For accommodations, write direct to the hotel. Oh yes, tell your friends and colleagues, and bring them along. Membership in CCCC is not necessary for attendance, only an interest in composition and/or communication.

The program (as announced by Program Chairman, Irwin Griggs, Temple University, with, in general, possible minor changes of one kind or another):

Three general sessions, opening on Thursday afternoon and concluding with the annual CCCC luncheon meeting Saturday noon. Topics for discussion at two of the general sessions: 1. The Place of Literature in the Freshman Course (Thursday afternoon at 1:30). 2. Reorganization of the Ph.D. Program for Preparing College Teachers of English (Friday evening at 8:30).

Three groups of panel discussions: Thursday evening at 8: 1. Contributions of the Social Sciences to Our Understanding of the Nature and Function of Language. 2. Composition and Communication: a Contrast. Friday morning at 10:45: 1. High School-College Co-operation in English. 2. Problems and Techniques of Teaching Spelling. 3. Freshman Programs: a Series of Cases. Satur-

day morning at 10:45: 1. Shall We Teach Grammar? 2. Encouraging Students to Become English Majors. 3. Reading Clinics: How They Operate and What They Accomplish.

Four workshop sessions, Thursday afternoon, Friday morning, Friday afternoon, Saturday morning—some continued from previous years, some new. 1. Use of a Freshman Writing Periodical. 2. Writing Clinics. 3. From Reading to Writing. 4. Preparation of the Composition/Communication Teacher. 5. Super-Freshman Composition: the Well-Equipped Student. 6. Sub-Freshman Composition: the Poorly Equipped Student. 7. The Content of a Communication Course. 8. The Foreign Student in the Freshman Course. 9. Improving Reading Ability. 10. Writing from Source Materials: the Documented Paper. 11. The Composition Career (of All Students) after the Freshman Year. 12. Integration of High School and College Teaching of English. 13. The Teaching and Testing of Listening Skills. 14. Imaginative Writing in Advanced Composition. 15. Final Examinations in Composition and Communication Courses. 16. Writing for Business and Industry. 17. Administering the Freshman Course.

The Local Committee: General Chairman, Falk S. Johnson, University of Illinois, Chicago. Associate Chairman, Willis C. Jackman, University of Illinois, Chicago. Treasurer, J. J. Lamberts, Northwestern University. *Registration and Information Services:* Chairman, Howard Wilcox, Wright Junior College; Aileen Burns, Crane Junior College; Irving Abrahamson, Roosevelt University; Florence Ballenger, Wilson Junior College; Marvin Laser, Chicago Teachers College. *Publishers' Representative:* Mark Ashin, University of Chicago. *Luncheon*

Tickets: Mollie Cohen, Illinois Institute of Technology. **Workshop Reservations:** Margaret Neville, DePaul University. **Publicity:** John S. Gerriets, Loyola University.

Exhibits. About twenty or more publishers of textbooks and makers of other materials for use in courses in composition and communication will have displays of their books and/or materials at this CCCC meeting.

Placement Service: At this spring meeting, March 24-26, at the Hotel Mor-

risson, the CCCC will undertake to facilitate interviews between CCCC members seeking positions and administrative representatives having vacancies to be filled. Such persons should write immediately to the Secretary, Mrs. Gladys K. Brown, Little Rock Junior College, Little Rock, Arkansas, presenting pertinent data about themselves or about vacancies.

March 24, 25, 26, Thursday, Friday, Saturday, 1955, Hotel Morrison, Chicago, Illinois.

Forty Years of Composition Teaching

HERBERT L. CREEK¹

When I began teaching composition at the University of Illinois in 1910, a pattern of instruction in writing was already established, and, in spite of frantic experimentation, there has been no revolution since. However, there have been many reforms, countless "successful" new methods, and vast "improvements," some of which I wish to review.

As a matter of fact my experience goes back a good deal farther than 1910. I was a member of a class in "rhetoric" in DePaul University in 1896, and I shall have something to say about that class. Modern composition teaching began, I presume, about 1884, when Barrett Wendell introduced the famed "daily theme" at Harvard. Of course there were themes earlier, but the idea of the daily theme was new. It quickly spread throughout the colleges of the country, where it usually took the form of a semi-weekly or weekly essay. How fast it spread, I am unable to say, but probably not fast enough. At least it had not reached DePaul University in 1896. There we were

still in a pre-theme era, an era that owed much to Harvard also.

The standard textbook before the time of the daily theme, and to a lessening extent afterwards, was *The Principles of Rhetoric*, by Adams Sherman Hill, Boylston Professor of Rhetoric and Oratory in Harvard College. The first edition appeared in 1878, not long after Hill began his Harvard teaching. The "revised and enlarged" edition I used was dated 1896. It was a lively and entertaining book. I have kept my copy, and like to look at it occasionally. It was very reassuring. It might have been called "The Mistakes of Great Authors." I read about the errors of Hawthorne, Thackeray, Trollope, Matthew Arnold, and many other very famous writers. Dickens made a mistake in the title of a novel, *Our Mutual Friends*. George Eliot wrote "cherubims" and "seraphims" in her *Amos Barton*. It was comforting to know that the great men and women whom we hoped to rival sometime could make so many errors. But so far as I can recall, we wrote no papers in which the instructor would mark *our* mistakes. Ten or twelve years had not been enough for the Harvard

¹ Purdue University; Professor Emeritus of English; Head of the Department of English, 1920-1950.

daily theme to be adopted in so remote a place as Greencastle, Indiana. As a matter of fact, I can remember only one correction on an English paper, and that paper was for a class in literature. I had written "weaved" as a past participle, and a student reader politely inserted "woven" above my error.

That must have been nearly all I learned about writing in my first two years of college, even though Professor Hill explained to us Narration, Description, Exposition, and Argument, and said that it is "incumbent on him who would write well to avoid FINE WRITING." Circumstances caused an interruption in my formal education, and when I re-entered college, it was after 1900, I was in another institution, and I had a professor of English who did something for my writing. This was Will Howe, with a fresh Ph.D. degree from Harvard. When I handed him a paper without organization or any other merits, he suggested that I look into Barrett Wendell's *English Composition*, published in 1891. Howe was teaching writing in Butler College in the true "daily theme" fashion, and although it was too late for me to take the composition course, he had me thinking seriously about what I must do if I cared to write decently. Sending me to Barrett Wendell's book was not unimportant. It was different from Hill's *The Principles of Rhetoric*. It really told one how to write clearly, and the writing of the book beautifully exemplified the principles explained. It told how to begin with a topic sentence, how to repeat the idea of a topic sentence at the end of the paragraph or larger unit, how to summarize the leading ideas; and the book itself did these very things in a fascinating way. I longed to write as well. And I tried at least. I owe a great deal to Wendell and to Will Howe for making me try to write logically in paragraphs. My own experience indicates that the

theme-writing course was well established in the Middle West by the beginning of the twentieth century.

Then I went to graduate school, where I had no training in composition except the incidental training of term papers and a long thesis. I thought little about teaching composition, although I knew I might have to teach freshman students how to write if I ever got a job. At the time I was afraid I should never have a job, never have a chance to put into use my years of training in Anglo-Saxon, Old French, and Middle English. And my fears were almost literally realized, for I never taught much of what I learned in two graduate schools. True, I got the degree, and I obtained a job as instructor in English at the University of Illinois. But along with a class or two in the survey of English literature, I found myself teaching two sections of freshman composition.

I became a teacher of college composition in complete innocence, for I had no idea as to what was expected. Our able composition chief, Frank Scott, later well known as author or co-author of textbooks, gave us and the students an outline. I knew that the students were supposed to hand in two themes a week—we had descended that far from the daily theme. I learned that we were supposed to hold conferences also. But what to do with the piles of themes—four sets a week for me—I did not know. I remember laboring through Saturday and through Sunday, becoming noticeably pale and worn, not knowing whether a paper should receive a grade of A or a grade of D. One of my students later told me that the class was delighted the first time I returned papers because nearly everybody got a B. Then a little later, when most of them were getting D's, they were not happy with an instructor who was so inconsistent.

Nor did I know what to do with the

class time. My classes met on the fifth floor of old University Hall, far away from full professors or even assistant professors, who did not like climbing. A fellow-teacher on that floor was a young graduate assistant who had had experience at least. He usually dismissed his classes twenty minutes or so before the end of the hour. I thought that was a fine idea and dismissed my own classes whenever my ideas were exhausted, which was often very early indeed. Then I became suspicious that his students were not learning very much and that mine weren't doing any better. Of course no one so ignorant about teaching writing as I was could get a job in freshman composition today.

As I look back now to those early years, however, I find them rather exciting. Changes were coming thick and fast—changes in textbooks, in supplementary reading, in methods, and in purpose. And the coming into existence of the National Council of Teachers of English in 1911 and the *English Journal* in 1912 meant opportunity for new ideas to get a hearing. I shall tell of some of the things that seem significant now.

The backbone of the course that I taught was Woolley's *Handbook of Composition*, which appeared in 1907 and was one of the most successful composition texts ever published. Woolley was a professor at the University of Wisconsin who got the idea that systematic training in details of writing might be given by means of a handbook so arranged that the instructor could place the number of a rule in the margin of a theme instead of writing out his suggestions. The book was so successful that almost every ambitious or needy teacher thought he should write another like it. Countless handbooks have followed to this day. Woolley's *Handbook* was far from "modern" as we know "modern." It knew nothing of "communications"

and "semantics," and little of "levels of usage" or of "descriptive grammar." It was as dogmatic as Adams Sherman Hill's *The Principles of Rhetoric*, but in a different way, since Hill seemed to be writing for prospective authors whereas Woolley knew that farm boys were coming to the state universities. There was a wrong way of saying things and a right way. There was hardly any recognition of the difference between colloquial and formal English. But at least both students and teachers knew where they stood. If Woolley said it was so, it *was* so.

Of course the Woolley system was not quite foolproof. Teachers would not grade alike. Some insisted on absolute "correctness"—in spelling, in punctuation, in sentence structure. Others insisted on not being bored by their students and would overlook a few misspelled words or an occasional comma fault. Some insisted on good paragraph structure. Others never noticed the paragraphs if the sentences were correct. Some tore their hair if they discovered one of their students writing "not as" instead of "not so" or "would" for "should." Others cared little for these minor errors. Some teachers would give a grade of E (failure) for these errors while others might give the same theme a grade of B because it wasn't dull. At Illinois and elsewhere staff meetings were held at which mimeographed copies of themes were passed out, and young teachers wrangled over grades and "fatal" errors. But teachers seldom agreed about how a particular piece of writing should be graded.

More "scientific" were the various scales prepared by psychologists and teachers of English. The most famous of these, I believe, was "A Scale for the Measurement of English Composition," by M. B. Hillegas, published in 1911. It was known generally as the Hillegas

Scale. It was based on several thousand sample themes and the grades of hundreds of teachers. The scale itself consisted of ten themes ranging from hopeless to the best a talented freshman could write. If a teacher had a theme to grade, he had merely to find the paper of the scale nearest his theme and then record the same grade. We were told that such scales would revolutionize theme grading. But in spite of the tremendous effort that went into their preparation, they failed of their purpose and are seldom heard of now. I can remember being a member of a large group of high school and college teachers at a meeting in which some expert psychologist was having us compare papers to determine which were superior and which inferior. I found to my chagrin that I was wrong as often as I was right—that is, if I agreed with the majority, it was by chance.

If Woolley's *Handbook* and the Hillegas Scale did not enable teachers to agree about grading, neither was there agreement about the special reading required of freshmen in composition. Already by 1910 the books of specimens were in wide use. At first the "literary" types were emphasized. The typical book was, I should say, another Harvard product—*Specimens of Prose Composition*, edited by Nutter, Hersey, and Greenough. It had excellent and rather popular "literary" selections and was suitable for students who wanted to learn to write clever descriptions or exciting narratives and who hoped to do some literary writing in later life. But pretty soon another type of anthology was prevalent. There was a group of teachers who wanted their students to "think." The way of getting them to think was to have an anthology such as *Representative Essays in Modern Thought*, edited by Steeves and Ristine, which appeared in 1913. It created a sensation among teachers. It consisted of essays such as

Arnold's "Sweetness and Light" and Huxley's "Science and Culture" that reflected conflicting opinions. The result of reading them was to make the students think clearly and therefore write clearly. Other books of a similar character followed in abundance and have continued to appear. Whether the method was successful is still a matter of doubt in my mind, but I suspect the instructors liked Steeves and Ristine very well and the students ignored it as much as they could. Later books of specimens of the "thought" type have been in the main less rugged than *Representative Essays in Modern Thought*, and probably have been successful when taught by teachers who like that sort of book.

Although the books that taught students to think and those consisting of literary models that taught students to write with polish were the chief types, there were others. For example, there were teachers not satisfied with the "thought" theme and yet not entirely sure that the literary theme was the ideal. They asked for papers based on personal experience on the assumption that for the masses of students they were both suitable and educational, since they began with the student's own life and excited the kind of "thought" of which he was capable. The result was still another kind of book of specimens, in which the emphasis was on autobiographical and biographical or at least personal material. And then during the First World War we learned that books could be used to indoctrinate. A course in War Aims combined writing with indoctrination in the principles of democracy and the political philosophy of Woodrow Wilson. We learned about the history of modern Europe and also about "American Ideals" from the book of that title edited by Foerster and Pierson. I say *we*—I mean the teachers—for the students didn't learn. At least they didn't learn

anything we were trying to teach them; they were too busy with such practical tasks as driving stakes to hold their tents in place and in learning how to keep step and shoulder arms. Nevertheless the tendency to indoctrinate introduced at that time has continued until the present, especially if the teachers happen to be earnest young people with some hope that their students can be trained to think about political and social matters.

Perhaps more important than choice of readings was the introduction of the oral theme. This became popular almost as soon as the handbook; at least it was being advocated by the time of the founding of the National Council in 1911. Its most important prophet was Professor J. M. Clapp, then teaching at Lake Forest College. He spoke beautifully himself, with a cultivated accent and a charming manner. I often wished I could speak like him. At any rate we were to teach our students to talk, not to make formal speeches—that was left for the professors of speech—but to stand before a class or other audience and talk entertainingly and gracefully for five or ten minutes. I think most of us tried this plan. Certainly the high school teachers of that time did. A rather elaborate experiment was tried in a number of Illinois high schools. A control group of high school students took a conventional course in ordinary writing. An experimental group wrote much less and gave much of its time to oral themes. The results were surprising, for it turned out that the students who wrote less and spoke more were writing better at the end of the experiment. This should have been enough, it seems, to settle the matter once for all. But it didn't. The college teachers who got the students trained in speaking still complained that they could not write, and the oral theme more or less vanished—in colleges at least—until communication courses revived

it. One important reason was the rise of aggressive speech departments in both colleges and high schools and their assumption of responsibility for teaching students to speak well. This was mainly after 1920.

By that time I was teaching in Purdue University, known as a technical institution, and something like a new era in composition and speech teaching was at hand. The First World War was followed by tremendous increases in college enrollments. The "literary" student was now clearly the exception, not the rule, at least in the state institutions with their thousands. More and more was said about the failure of composition teachers to solve the problem of clear expository writing. Professors in departments other than English, particularly in science and engineering, were unpleasantly critical. Business and industrial concerns wanted to know what was wrong with teachers of English, who were accused of dwelling in ivory towers, of trying to teach "literary" writing, or of being effeminate and unable to command the respect of masculine students. (That was the day of the "he-man," so prominent in the service clubs then just becoming prominent.)

Various things happened. The practice of classifying students on the basis of their preparation and ability in composition, which had been in use in some institutions for several years, was extended in the nineteen twenties. Many of the weaker students were relegated to non-credit courses to make up high-school deficiencies. Teachers of English in some instances became more practical. Persons in charge of the composition courses insisted more and more on uniformity and discipline. Separate staffs to teach business students or engineering students were built up and prided themselves on doing a better job than their conventional colleagues teaching the students in the

liberal arts. Special textbooks for technical, agricultural, or business students appeared. Books of readings were also more practical. They used less "standard" literature and more popular articles from current magazines. Since the freshman composition class did not accomplish its purpose, or at least failed to give training that would survive into the senior year, various attempts were made to continue training in writing for the students who could not write successfully in their upper classes. In many institutions a special examination was given at the end of the sophomore or in the junior year, and those failing it were assigned to additional work in writing. Various kinds of co-operation of English and other departments in the matter of student writing were tried. Writing clinics for feeble students were established here and there. These plans and changes, the results of increased enrollments and decline in the quality of students, continued to be tried and are still being tried.

In the thirties the depression had an important effect on composition teaching. Since there were too many teachers of college literature for the demand, doctors of philosophy in English and American literature, instead of having special courses in Chaucer or American Transcendentalism, were forced to teach freshman composition in order to have bread. And with greater dignity in the teachers of composition there was more respect for the teachers and the teaching. This has continued to the present time. Graduate schools learned that persons very competent in seventeenth literature were fortunate to have jobs in which they taught one class in literature for freshmen or sophomores along with two or three classes in freshman composition. Graduate departments of English discovered, reluctantly, that there were engineering colleges looking for well-trained teachers of English, that there

was a growing number of junior colleges with large classes in composition, and that it was better, at least for the professors teaching graduate courses, to have graduate students who would probably never teach a graduate course in *Beowulf* or the history of criticism than to have no graduate students. So we began to have distinguished specialists in linguistics, in semantics, and in logic who were teaching graduate students how to apply what they could learn about these subjects to composition teaching, including theme grading. This movement was becoming evident by 1940 and has continued.

We are now in the Era of Conferences. We get together, listen to experts, and talk over our many problems. But the most significant kind of conference just now seems to be the one concerned with convincing business men and industrialists that we are training college men in writing and literature so that they can be useful in an industrial world; and our friends in business and industry are responding—at least by coming to our conferences and by saying pleasant things about our co-operative spirit as well as giving hints that we might do a better job. Sometimes they make us think that graduates with a major in English may be the future bosses of the technicians who know only engineering or science. One wonders what these attempts at liaison between English and the practical world will mean for the teaching of English. Perhaps we can persuade our doubtful academic colleagues and business friends that we too are at home in a practical world.

But more important than the status of the teacher of composition among so-called practical persons is his status in his own department. Has it improved? I believe it has. The fact that we have a Conference on College Composition and Communication means something. The

presence in many departments of successful literary men and women whose duty it is to stimulate and guide promising student writers is an encouraging sign. On the other hand, successful teachers of ordinary students, lacking the prestige of successful literary publication themselves, are not so clearly in a position that commands respect. Never-

theless, the changes mentioned in this paper indicate some improvement in status for these teachers also. Forty-five years ago, when I was looking for a job, a distinguished head of a department of English said to me, "Oh, if you can't get anything else, we might let you read themes." That remark was typical then. It would not be typical now.

A Discipline of the Communication Skills¹

HERBERT HACKETT²

We are like the psychiatrist who had a patient. As they started, the psychiatrist said, "I've asked these questions so often that I've had them recorded. I'll turn the recorder on and you can answer it. I'll be at the corner bar." While he was enjoying a beer, the patient came in and sat beside him. "I thought you were answering questions." "I was," the patient said, "but you see, I've answered these questions so many times that I thought I would put my answers on tape. Now my recorder is answering questions from your recorder."

We who teach the Freshman courses in English are like the psychiatrist in that we have played our records so often to each other. With notable exceptions we have failed to go outside our profession to draw on the wealth of other disciplines and, having no discipline of our own, we remain at the bottom of the teaching profession, cheek to jowl with teachers of typing.

Some of you will feel that I am overstating the case, but the truth is that, whether or not the teaching of skills is a job, it is not a profession based on a discipline; it does not have, as we will hear,

a rigorous graduate program; it does not have a coherent methodology; it does not have any substantial body of data based on controlled observation or experiment. It does have several philosophies, a notoriety, a jargon . . . and it does have its schools or "camps," at one extreme those who have plunged into General Semantics, personality development, group dynamics, listening or "practical" communication, at the other those who spend their time with workbook exercises in the thirteen kinds of adverbial phrases, poetry and themes on nothing at all.

These are not my straw men but those I have met each year at these conventions or, more noticeably, at those of a sister organization. In this struggle I am, by necessity, a neutral. At Utah we have not two but four camps, ranging, if I am free to be poetic, from Kierzek to Perrin.

The reason that neither camp is able to demolish the other is that neither has the weapons, except perhaps the boomerang. We all face the same problems and are vulnerable to the same attack. The problem is that, with rare exceptions, we are not trained to do the job we are paid to do . . . and the exceptions are, I suspect, self-trained. If we are to have a profession, a discipline to work in and with, we must train men for it and not—to take some horrible examples from the

¹ A paper given as part of a panel discussion, "Status for the Teacher of the One Hundred Percent," at the CCCC Luncheon Meeting in Detroit, Michigan, on November 26, 1954.

² University of Utah

graduate work of my friends—in Frisian, Victorian poetry, ancient rhetoric (Aristotle to Castelvetro), or “theater,” whatever that is. One friend even took his degree at Princeton, where, I take it, problems of reading and writing are absent.

Look at the absurdity of your training or, if you prefer, mine, in the light of what we need to know to teach simple exposition.

What we need is a discipline, not a narrowing one like traditional philology, rhetorical history or whatever, but a broadening one which ranges through many other disciplines, borrowing, adapting, creating, combining.

What is a discipline? For simplicity we might say that a discipline does at least four things: defines a set of purposes, organizes a subject matter, creates and uses a methodology, and develops a formal nature—this division following closely Aristotle’s Four Causes, the final, the material, the efficient and the formal. We have all been trained in some discipline, although in literature we do not usually think in these terms. The most disciplined of us have been trained in linguistics, at times a pure, one might almost say “immaculate” science; as one linguist once told me, “We never ask questions about applications.”

Let us look at each of these four briefly and see in what respects a discipline of the communication skills is possible.

If we are to formulate a discipline, we must first determine what our purpose is, determine whether or not we are a pure or applied science, or no science at all but an art, and whether we wish to admit normative considerations.

Obviously we are a discipline like that of architecture, part applied science and part art. If we study linguistics we will ask, “For what purpose?” When we study literature we will want to know what the poetry of Keats, for example, has to do with the writing processes of 1954 fresh-

men—and I would think that it has a great deal to do with these processes. If we search *The Red Badge of Courage* for examples of artistic expression, we will also search it for insight into the development of thinking in a young man, and we will want to apply this insight to our knowledge about the process of thinking as described by the psychologist.

We will be an applied, a behavioral and a normative science . . . and an art.

A discipline is, second, a body of data. Before this group I hesitate to say exactly what this subject matter must be. I haven’t the confidence of the little Mormon girl in Salt Lake City who, when asked by a visitor if she knew where Boston is, said without hesitation, “Yes, we have a mission there.” I have no mission here, but I will try to set the framework in which most of this subject matter could fit.

If this is a discipline of human behavior, we need to understand the nature of man, and I assume that all behavior depends on language. We must first, then, take that from psychology which relates to the development of the child through the socializing of the language processes, at least a basic understanding of Piaget and George Herbert Mead. We must understand the psychology of perception and cognition, of motivation and learning, of the relation of thought to language, perhaps even physiology and the mechanics of transmission as described in cybernetics.

We are led naturally from the study of the individual to the study of social processes, as found in social psychology, sociology, and anthropology. We must account for the relationships between culture and the individual, answering for example the question of Benjamin Lee Whorf: Does the culture through language determine in part what the individual is able to perceive, to formulate,

to know, to communicate? Or the question of Bronislaw Malinowski: What are the functional relationships between linguistic and nonlinguistic behavior? Or the question which so interests the philosopher and the General Semanticist: What is meaning?

Bloomfield and Charles Morris have suggested simple formulae for the arrangement of the subject matter of our discipline, and the psycho-linguists such as John Carroll have elaborated this somewhat as follows:

1. The nature of the external world.
2. The perception of the external world, including physical factors such as acoustics and the psychological factors.
3. The encoding process, the translation of perception into ideas and words.
4. The process of transmission, primarily mechanics.
5. The code, or what we have traditionally called "linguistics."
6. The message, not only the more or less objective understanding but, since we are an art also, the emotional understanding of what is said.
7. The process of receiving, closely related to the process of sending.
8. The decoding, related to the encoding process.
9. The resultant action, verbal or non-verbal.
10. The reflexive process, in which the language act becomes a stimulus to itself; we might call it the "continuing process."

It is obvious to you that the discipline of the skills of communication is more than a mere behavioral science, obvious because you feel that you have caught me in *flagrante delicto*, committing a social science. As an art we are concerned with the good, the beautiful, the imaginative, and not only the knowledge about these things but their inculcation.

We want our students to write and speak well.

It is just at this point of what is *good* writing that much of our past practice has fallen short of effectiveness. We have too often, because of our own specialized interests and training, emphasized the "literary" or the historical. In my present frame of reference—which I do not suggest is the only one—I suggest that we look for the good in terms of the pragmatism of James and its modification in the social instrumentalism of Dewey. The good for James—he is talking about ethics—is that action which is efficient for stated ends. Determine the respective efficiency of acts for certain ends and you have a science of value.

The obvious weakness of this approach is that each man may have a different end, and we get a Babel-tower of confusion of standards. Dewey suggests that alternative instruments, for us the instruments of writing and speaking, be evaluated in terms of their efficiency for *social* ends. This leads to a cultural relativity, not a loose and vague anarchy as some have said, but to a point of view which demands the most rigorous observation and evaluation. Dewey argues in *Quest for Certainty* that all standards which have been established have been shown to be relative to a particular society at a particular time and place and that to reintroduce arbitrary standards is a retrogressive step, in that it asserts an absolute.

If we follow the lead of Dewey we will measure all communication by our *highest* social goals, not the mean common denominator; our measure of efficiency would include not alone the tool functions of language but those of beauty and ethics as well.

It is clear, in this framework, that any normative discipline must satisfy the following conditions:

1. The standard cannot be absolute.

2. The standard must be rigorous in formation; "good" writing, for example, will be judged on the basis of an exacting study of social goals and of the best ways of attaining these goals. The rigor is in the observation and process of formulation, not in the formulation itself.

3. The standard must allow for its progressive reformulation; it must be reflexive, including itself in its own observation.

4. The standard cannot be outside the expectations of our culture, but must reflect it. We cannot "reform" language or usage by an academy of taste.

Lest it seem that my formulation of a pragmatic or instrumental philosophy of rhetoric is a radical departure from our tradition, I need only point out that the greatest of all rhetorics, Aristotle's *Poetics*, is just this kind of pragmatic thing: Certain plays have proven good; their characteristics are unity, and so forth.

I have spent so much time with the subject matter of the new discipline largely to lay the ground for a discussion of method, the core of any discipline. Method may be divided into four parts: How do we discover? How do we formulate generalizations? How do we teach? How do we evaluate?

The answer to the first question, as we have noted, is "by observation." Observation will range from the controlled experiment done under ideal conditions, rarely found in the behavioral sciences except in the rat maze, to the observation by a trained observer under relatively uncontrolled situations. In either case the necessity is for trained observation, using the suitable instruments. Most of us have been well trained to observe, but in areas largely tangential to the teaching of simple exposition, in linguistics, literature, propaganda analysis, etc.

At the present state of my knowledge I can only speculate. First, it will be a

non-quantitative observation, in the main. The syllable, affix and word count of Rudolf Flesch are valuable raw data, but they suffer from an assumption of the value of quantitative evaluations of the communicated word. We must start, often, from such data, but cannot jump to quantitative conclusions. Flesch does what needs to be done first, but his quantitative variables are treated as entities, as if they had existence. What is necessary, it seems to me, in a science of language behavior, is the sense of relationship; sentence length, for example, is important only as atom structure is important to a physicist, only in its relational aspects.

This is not to belittle studies such as those of Flesch, but to say that in language we are not dealing with discrete variables but with relationships. This is difficult for us to grasp; the whole concept of non-quantitative method has developed slowly in the natural sciences, over a period of a century, and is not yet firmly established in all areas. Luckily, we do not have to repeat the mistakes of others; science is an exponential force; we can start in the middle.

A second important concern in methodology is with the formation of generalizations. Actually, science runs from generalization or hypothesis to observation back to generalization, an infinite spiral leading to generalizations so refined that we use them as laws.

Of the many characteristics of the scientific generalization we may select the *frame of reference* as the most important: A generalization is true, in the words of this paper "useful," only as it operates under certain understood circumstances and for explicit purposes and with explicit limitations. The weakness of the old rhetoric, as taught to many of us, was that it set itself no such limitations; it was absolute. The scientific generalization is always: In so far as these condi-

tions are true, and given these ends, then . . . It does not exclude other frames of reference.

Such a view, obviously, does not permit the inflexibility of Marxian or Freudian interpretations of literature, or the absolute grammar, or the dogma of any orthodoxy, old or new. For example, it is not consistent with my frame of reference to say: There *are* nine parts of speech. The statement would read: It is convenient for certain purposes to divide words into nine categories; for other purposes other categories may be more useful. Such, of course, is the implication of the work of men like Charles Fries, not the accuracy of their classifications but the method which calls them forth. It is, in a scientific frame of reference, of no meaning to say that the categories of Fries are false or true, only that they are useful or not for certain ends and given certain limitations.

In the next few years we will, I hope, develop a methodology. We will obviously borrow—from the new linguistics, from the non-directive techniques of Carl Rogers, from the psychiatry of Jurgen Reusch, from the “functional” field method of Malinowski, from the experimental techniques of the ethno- and psycholinguists, from content analysis, from the cybernetics of Norbert Wiener, from the animal maze of Tolman—but we cannot assume that any of these techniques can be used without change. Too often we have borrowed without evaluating.

I can not go into the problems of teaching beyond a few generalizations. Most of our information about the teaching of skills is based on studies in the primary and secondary schools. Most college studies lack the two essentials of scholarly study: they are not tested for validity; they are not rechecked for reliability. Nine-tenths of them, including my own, are impressionistic, colored by the teacher’s bias and enthusiasm. Most

of us deplore the work of educationalists and their intrusion into the field of English, but the fault is ours.

Let one example illustrate the problem: It has been demonstrated that the individual’s perceptions are properties of the total cognitive field, that he perceives the parts in terms of the whole. It follows *logically* that the grammar, the sentence, the paragraph—any part—should be taught in terms of the whole communication situation, deductively, analytically. This is the logic, but where is the empirical evidence? I know of none, and yet each of us teaches as if we knew what this evidence would prove.

The final problem of methodology is related to the first three: How do we measure what we have done? Again, I want to pass this by, in part because I have suggested some of the solutions, but largely because I do not know. In my frame of reference, of course, the measures will be pragmatic.

We have considered three major aspects of a discipline, purpose, content and methodology. We are left with the fourth, for me the most difficult. Each discipline must formally look at its logic, its total definition, its formal nature. In a rough sense this paper is just such a formal presentation, but it is, by necessity, only a preliminary guess. The major problem is the integration of behavioral science, as discussed here, and of art. I think that they can be integrated only at the pragmatic level . . . but I don’t know.

I would like, however, to close by suggesting the general nature of the discipline I am proposing, the theoretical characteristics of any discipline based on the frame of reference I have adopted.

The new discipline will be interdisciplinary, with emphasis on inter-relationships of the individual in his social matrix. It will be interested in configurations, the larger gestalten, rather than

on individual data themselves. It will be relative, in the sense that I have defined relative, and normative. Its relativism will be of a kind with Galileo's interest in variables, the functionalism of anthropology or operational approach of atomic physics, and the field theory of Kurt Lewin. It will strive to get at constellations on interdependent variables, open energy systems, circular rather than lineal, causal chains.

There will be a corresponding valuation of spontaneity, unplanned interaction rather than controls and formulae. The result will be a philosophical indeterminism, the abandonment of closed logical systems and causal absolutes, and a fear of all cut and dried systems, especially the mechanistic.

Does the prospect frighten you? It does me. We know so little about so much. We are in the position of the social-psychologists of forty years ago, of the psycho-linguists today; we have to face the fact that our present attack on

our problems is limited by our lack of a discipline, by undefined purpose, by undefined subject matter, by inadequate methodology and by a lack of a formal philosophy.

In outlining a discipline I am, of course, not discussing what the content of courses in skills should be, or suggesting that each of us will be competent in all aspects of the discipline, any more than I would suggest that a student of literature can range easily the whole discipline of literature. The discipline is the whole body of knowledge and skill, in which we each must find our place.

Probably my generalizations are inadequate to the task I have set, but our intellectual life is like a coral reef, built on the bones of myriads of polyps. I do not mean that we are "small, flowerlike water animals having a mouth fringed with many small, slender tentacles, at the top of a tubelike body . . ." or that I have gone plop, but you get the idea.

A New Look by Administrators at Rank, Salary, and Teaching Load¹

JOHN C. HODGES²

It is truly refreshing to consider our basic freshman course philosophically, to look deep into the very nature of the course and determine what the discipline ideally should be. By this means we might well bring to our work a new dignity, a new sense that ours is indeed a profession. Perhaps we of the CCCC are too persistently borne down by our heavy load of freshmen, by the very practical situation before us, to give adequate attention to matters deeper and more fun-

damental. But after this admission I fear I must be guilty, during the few minutes at my disposal, of taking you away from the refreshing ideal—back to the problem facing us, as teachers of the mother tongue, this very quarter or semester.

According to a report in the November, 1954, issue of *The CEA Critic*, a distinguished scholar from New England would solve all our problems by denying college entrance to students who still need the usual beginning freshman English course. He considers the "battalions" of college composition teachers nothing less than a "monstrosity." That we cannot agree with this opinion is

¹ A paper given as part of a panel discussion, "Status for the Teacher of the One Hundred Percent," at the CCCC Luncheon Meeting in Detroit, Michigan, on November 26, 1954.

² University of Tennessee

proved by our membership in the CCCC. We are realists enough to believe that we should do our best to solve our immediate problems even though these problems ideally should not exist. But we should also realize that we, as college teachers of English, should give much more of our thought and effort (through the NCTE and otherwise) to help our high schools prepare their graduates so well that most of the present freshman English will become unnecessary.

The topic assigned me implies that I am speaking from the point of view of an administrator (I do give half my time to departmental administration), but I shall inevitably be influenced by the fact that I am an actual teacher of the one hundred per cent. This quarter my teaching load consists entirely of freshmen. Last year it was half freshmen and half graduates, and throughout my teaching career the load has never been less than half freshmen.

Although my topic seems to call for statistics, I promise to impose on you only the few that I can hold in my poor memory. Fortunately most of these are already well known by this group. The normal teaching load for a full-time English instructor, we know, is about 12 hours weekly—4 sections of some 25 students each. Departments with a nine-hour schedule or with as few as 15 students per section are unfortunately rarer than those who teach 15 (or even more) hours weekly or who have as many as 35 in a section. We know, too, that if the salary range of an English department is from \$3000 to \$8000 (or from \$4000 to \$10,000 or more), the salaries of those teaching the 100% will usually not be much above the \$3000 or \$4000 minimum, and the rank, except for the director of the course, will be too frequently that of instructor or graduate assistant. We don't need to be told that standards for teaching load, salary, and rank are

often far short of what is requisite for satisfactory teaching.

But the administrators of English departments who would raise these standards have very real problems. The first of these is to get from the general administration authorization for enough staff members to insure a reasonable load; for no matter what the salary or rank may be, no teacher can properly direct more than fifty or sixty students in composition courses. This is not to say that he cannot, at the same time, properly teach other students in literature or speech. My experience shows that administrators in at least three universities (including both state-supported and privately endowed) can be induced to supply the funds needed to keep the load within reasonable, if not ideal, bounds. It may be necessary to educate key members of the administration, and perhaps to re-educate them every few years; that is, to show them (1) why the freshman course in the mother tongue, basic to all other courses, is the most important of all and (2) why it requires of the instructor more time than any other course because of the essential paper reading and conferences with individuals. The proper attitude for the department is this: "We'll do our best, whatever our load, but only a reasonable load will enable us to provide the training demanded by the supporters of the university for their sons and daughters—and incidentally what must be provided if the students are to succeed in their whole college program." Perhaps the department can thus get a section limit of 20—or even 15—students.

Once the general university administration has provided an English budget sufficient to keep the teaching load within reasonable bounds, it is the department's responsibility to work out an effective program from the freshman through the graduate years. Any idea

that the freshman part is less important than the graduate does not stem from the general administration. On the contrary, it has a very special interest in the freshman, as I have observed on many occasions. One instance came recently to my attention in a letter searching for a departmental head, salary \$8,300 to \$12,000, with the outstanding requirement that this new head must be able to develop a strong freshman program. General university administrations seem to recognize better than many English departments that the freshman course is the most important offered by the department. If that course is ineffective, so will be the courses for the rest of the English program—and the whole college will suffer.

What can the administrator of an English department do to give dignity to the teaching of freshman composition, to make it seem really worth while? He must believe that the course is of prime importance and must so administer the whole English program that the freshmen are never neglected. In order that we may see more objectively some of his problems, let us consider the actual English enrollment this fall in a more or less typical university: about 1800 freshmen, 1150 sophomores, 220 juniors and seniors in elective courses, and 40 graduates—a total departmental load just over 3200. The 1800 freshmen make up over half the total—56%; the sophomores, 35%; the juniors and seniors, 7%; and the graduates, less than 2%. The 1800 are divided into 75 sections of 24 students; the 1150 into 41 sections of 28 students; the 220 into 13 sections (or classes) averaging 17; and the 40 into 5 groups averaging 8. With a twelve-hour teaching load, about 19 instructors will be needed for freshmen, 10+ for the sophomores, 3+ for the juniors-seniors, and 1+ for

the graduates—a total of about 36 full-time staff members if some allowance is made for administration.

It is evident that 5 or 6 of the 36 staff members could teach all of the 260 students in courses beyond the sophomore year, but I submit to you that any such arrangement would be most unwise, both for the advanced courses and for the basic courses of the first two years. A comprehensive English program, for lower and upper classes and graduates, should be a unit engaging the best thought of the whole staff. A senior staff member will naturally teach an advanced course in a field in which he has shown outstanding scholarship. But this limited amount of advanced teaching would still allow the senior member to have a part in the planning *and teaching* of the basic courses. And the junior members of the staff, as they prove their teaching ability and scholarship, would have a chance to teach an advanced course. Just as the senior members are limited in their advanced teaching and take part with the freshmen, so the junior members never teach a full load of freshmen but have a fourth or more of their work in literature—and at least the possibility of advanced work. In other words, there is a flexibility like that in the ideal free-enterprise system. To set up any closed compartment, whether it be for the freshman, the graduate, or any other part of the program, would hamper the development of the individual staff member and stagnate the program.

When all members of the English staff, regardless of rank and salary, help to plan and teach the basic course, and when they value the course no less than the general administration and those who have set it apart as the only course to be taken by all students, then we shall indeed have status for the course.

Integration of the Teaching of English in High Schools and Colleges in Texas

T. F. MAYO¹

In the spring of 1944 the English department of the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas undertook light-heartedly to establish co-ordination with the English department of every high school in the state. Our first letter evoked a large number of enthusiastic replies. The second drew about one hundred answers out of a possible 1400. The third fell flat. Convinced, perhaps belatedly, by this painful experience that to be successful any such co-ordinating movement must be more broadly based, we succeeded in organizing in 1945 a state-wide joint committee of English teachers from both high schools and colleges. This body of twelve hard workers planned and set up in October, 1945, a movement with the sonorous title of *The Integration of English Teaching in the High Schools and Colleges of Texas*.

The Integration Committee's first move was to get ourselves made respectable through the sponsorship of the two powerful professional organizations in our respective spheres, the *Texas State Teachers Association* and the *Texas Conference of College Teachers of English*. This process was fairly simple. Having obtained the permission of the chairmen concerned, we read to the English section of the T.S.T.A. and to the whole T.C.C.T.E. our tentative list of "musts" for English teaching. With a minimum of pressure and corrupt vote-getting in influential quarters, our program was enthusiastically adopted in a burst of crusading spirit by both bodies. Furthermore, the college teachers voted us a yearly stipend which made up in good

will what it lacked in size, and the T.S.T.A. came through with an immediate subsidy (never repeated!).

This last item materialized in the well-known nick of time, for the self-appointed Integration Committee had already, even before being made an Honest Committee by the hasty alliance of its component bodies, printed (on precarious credit) and mailed to every high school and college English department in Texas two copies (one for the department, one for the principal or dean) of a printed list of irreducible minima (according to us!) in such matters as writing assignments, reading requirements, and grammar studies. In other words, we had sought at once to set up and publicize what we, both high school and college teachers, agreed to be the "musts" of English teaching—not high school teaching or college freshman teaching but English teaching, period.

The Integration Committee, by now formidably respectable and in good standing, then proceeded to extend and regularize its own membership so as to include two members, high school and college respectively, from each of the eleven educational districts of Texas. In the first flush, moreover, of this infusion of fresh blood, the enlarged Committee planned and set in motion the eleven Annual English Workshops, one in each district, held normally on the most convenient weekend of October. The members of the State Integration Committee from each district serve alternately as Workshop Chairman and Program Chairman during the two years of their incumbency. Every English department—high school or college—is invited to join, for

¹The Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas

all of its members, the Workshop of its district. The attending member pays, besides, fifty cents of his own. The Workshop program, lasting one or two days according to district choice, severely excludes "addresses," and consists of free interchange of views, pump-primed by short practical talks, and followed by the adoption of resolutions which express a consensus. A general topic for each year, chosen by the Central Committee on Integration from suggestions sent by the various workshops, concentrates our fire and has so far produced excellent discussions. The Workshop attendance has averaged about one hundred in each district. Even assuming that two-thirds of the attendance consists year after year of Old Faithfuls, we may safely estimate, we think, that since their birth in October, 1946, the English Workshops have drawn into the open field of genuine workmanlike shop-talk a total of about 3,500 English teachers. And there are no signs of any diminution of interest.

A great deal depends, of course, upon the energy, imagination, and judgment of the current chairman of the State Committee on Integration. The office alternates between a high school and a college teacher, each serving for two years. Both of these features are important. Next, the choice of topic means a lot. So far, we have wrangled amicably about such topics as (1) the balancing of composition, language teaching, and reading (This was in the early enthusiastic days! It was far too big.); (2) how to increase and improve reading; (3) the co-ordination of language study with composition; (4) the use in English teaching of public media like newspapers, magazines, radio, and TV. (This looked wonderful in advance, but was disappointing and "frilly."); (5) just how to teach writing; (6) how to teach literature.

In addition to the Workshops, its chief pride and joy, the Committee on Inte-

gration has also tried, with varying success, to induce the individual schools to measure the thoroughness of their own English work by testing their students' ability to write in the second term of their junior year.

A sympathetic expert at the University of Texas, Dr. Manuel, generously worked up three tests—high, middle, and easy—from which each school may select the one which seemed best to suit the general level of its own pupils. Those who made below a certain grade, also determined by the invaluable Dr. Manuel, are to be given a remedial course in their senior year. At one time over a hundred schools were following this procedure. The present writer cannot report the present state of the project.

To everybody's surprise, the financial support of the integration movement has never, after the first brave, plunging days, presented a serious problem. The district committees simply turn over their surpluses to the State Committee. There always seems to be money, not much but enough.

Another gratifying feature of the whole project has been our complete freedom (so far!) from any group feeling between high school and college teachers. Oh, of course it should go without saying that such a childish sentiment could never arise in our august profession. All the same, however, it has been a pleasant surprise to find that it did not show its horrid head. Perhaps one naturalistic explanation of this miracle has been the Committee's steady realization that the high schools could not be expected to turn themselves into training grounds for future college students. We have insisted—all of us, high school and college alike—that what our integration movement wants is simply *for every teacher to teach his or her students to write and read as well as their abilities and their current ages will permit.*

NSSC News

JEAN MALMSTROM¹

Eight sectional meetings on communication were held during the NSSC National Convention in Chicago, December 27-30. Since NSSC is an affiliate of the Speech Association of America, these sectional meetings were incorporated in the SAA convention program. Such topics as the following were discussed: "Problems of International Language and Communication," "Democracy, Ethics, and Communication," "Problems of Communication in Adult Education," "Communication in Industry," "Communication in Government," "What's New in College Communication Courses?"

Earnest Brandenburg, a charter member of the society, is in charge of the programs sponsored by NSSC to be presented at the annual convention of the Central States Speech Association Convention to be held in St. Louis at the Hotel Jefferson, on April 1 and 2, 1955.

On Friday, April 1, there is scheduled a meeting concerned with the problems of communication in business and industry. Representatives of four major corporations, and of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, will join with leaders from several universities to present current programs and to discuss ways in which the teacher of speech provides needed service to business and industry.

On Saturday, April 2, there will be meetings dealing with teaching communication skills in high school, with integrating a communication skills program at the college level, with methods of teaching listening in high school, and with detailed reports of progress on a

variety of research projects in the communication field.

A news release by CSSA to "communication people" states that "this is one of the broadest programs in communication ever scheduled at a Central States Speech Association convention, and it should provide a wealth of valuable information for teachers of speech at both the high school and college level as well as for speech-trained personnel who have entered business as directors of training."

It would seem that the program would be equally valuable to CCCC members. They are cordially invited to attend.

The 1954 annual report of the president, Kenneth B. Clark, states that NSSC now has a membership of 440 and a treasury balance of \$1,000, as well as "close and pleasant working conditions with the Speech Association of America, many regional speech associations, and with the College Conference on Composition and Communication."

The president's report also states: "The communications center of the society and consequently the operational hub is the Executive Secretary," Donald E. Bird, who "has not only met the exacting demands of routine operation . . . [but] has somehow found additional time to publish four issues of the *Newsletter*, to get out both the membership *Directory* and *Supplement* and to play a prominent role on several special committees this year."

In the concluding paragraphs of his report President Clark takes a close look at the state of the society: "The early years of the society were marked, and rightly so, by considerable exploration,

¹ Western Michigan College of Education

much reaching out for the new and the intriguing, and some disregard and neglect of already existing projects. One possible reason . . . for the loss of some of our original members may have been the apparent changing nature of the organization, or the fact that changes were not in the desired direction for those persons. In our efforts to get started we may have tried to be all things to all men.

"At the beginning of this year I found it helpful to my own thinking to restate and interpret these aims and objectives of the organization as I understood them from the published writings of Nichols, Murray, Lillywhite and other founders of the society. Without such formulation of aims it was patently impossible to give consistent direction to the work of the society. I was somewhat disturbed in this process to discover not a little disagreement between our announced and

our existing structure and emphasis.

"This December we will celebrate our sixth year of existence. We are quite a way along the road to becoming what we shall be. We are no longer justified, I feel, to merely verbalize an ideal society. We must take stock of what we already are, identify those areas where we do not yet match up with our announced intentions, obtain agreement and acceptance of what should be done about the discrepancies, and then do something about them. We should not, like children at play, abandon current projects because they no longer amuse us. 'New' projects are not always a sign of progress or adaptability. On the other hand, if we decide some announced objective is no longer realistic, we should face the fact, divorce ourselves from the attempt, and withdraw the announcement."

Help for the Problem Speller

H. ALAN WYCHERLEY¹

Poor spelling has for several decades been one of the most vexing problems that have beset the college teacher of composition. For one thing, not very much can be done about the really bad speller, despite instructions to look up words in the dictionary, to correct misspellings in all written work, and to consult the most-frequently-misspelled lists which appear in most handbooks. Such devices, I feel, may lead to improvement in the student who is merely careless, but they accomplish very little in the student whose misspelling is due to a much graver weakness: faulty co-ordination of the physical and intellectual processes involved in the use of written language. In the pages that follow I suggest a method

of treating the problem speller at what I take to be the source of his difficulty.

I am not concerned with the occasional misspeller, the one who can't remember that there are two c's and two m's in *accommodate* or who will omit an r or an s from *embarrass*. Everyone acknowledges that our language is plagued by words of this sort, and the student who occasionally—or even frequently—flubs such words as *ecstasy*, *innocuous*, *exhilarate*, *illegitimate*, *bourgeoisie*, has my sympathy, not my scorn.

But there are other kinds of errors which betray not simple uncertainty or carelessness but rather a failure of the faculties of writing. The eye, the ear, or the hand, or all three, will have failed to enable the writer to set down correctly

¹ United States Naval Academy

the graphic symbol of the word he wishes to use. Consider these examples:

I. Aural errors (resulting from hearing slurred, dialectal, or other kinds of mispronunciations)

DEFFENTLY	for	DEFINITELY
KINEHEARTED	for	KINDHEARTED
DOING	for	DURING (as in "doing the last war")
ATHELETE	for	ATHLETE
SOPHMORE	for	SOPHOMORE

II. Additive errors (adding an unnecessary letter)

SERVERE	for	SEVERE
OFFICIER	for	OFFICER
CASUALITIES	for	CASUALTIES
DINNING	for	DINING
NERVIOUS	for	NERVOUS

III. Subtractive errors (omitting a necessary letter or syllable)

CRITIZE	for	CRITICIZE
CLOSSAL	for	COLOSSAL
CONVIENT	for	CONVENIENT
TEMPERMENT	for	TEMPERAMENT
RIGITY	for	RIGIDITY

IV. Metathetic or inversive errors

REALTION	for	RELATION
MERIDAIN	for	MERIDIAN
COMMERICAL	for	COMMERCIAL
DECSEND	for	DESCEND
ERREONOUS	for	ERRONEOUS

The student who frequently makes errors like these is a not unfamiliar figure among freshmen on college campuses. Sometimes he is a likeable fellow who acknowledges his incompetence, but more often he is not. He is surprised that his papers are given failing grades, and he takes counsel with ill grace. Often he simply can't see his errors, and will bitterly argue, for instance, that the spelling NERVIOUS is all right. Sometimes it will take him many seconds with the dictionary spelling directly before him to see that his spelling is wrong. And he will often look at his instructor as if to say that the whole business is a con-

spiracy against him. He is likely to be failing in his foreign language and doing poorly in all his humanities courses. In the classroom he may be docile; but more often he is aggressive, not to learn, but to find fault with class procedure, whatever it is at the moment.

It is common practice in colleges and universities to place such students in special sections, where they are given review grammar and much practice in writing. They study frequency lists in their handbooks and their instructors urge them to make lists of their own misspellings and to practice writing them correctly. Sometimes this is sufficient for borderline cases who are able to pick up enough of what they missed during their earlier schooling to continue college work.

But the trouble with word lists is that the student feels he must memorize words that he misses or those which appear in the "Five Hundred Most Commonly" lists in his handbook. Such practice is fine for the occasional misspeller, but it is of small help to the chronic misspeller, because it does not go to the root of his difficulty. By dint of much effort (for him) he may learn that it is DINING, not DINNING. But on his next theme may appear WINING for WINNING or TRILE for TRIAL. The word-list method, in short, treats the branches, but not the root. And the root of the difficulty goes deep, perhaps all the way back to the first grade, or earlier. Whatever faulty techniques he picked up there were probably compounded through the subsequent years of his schooling, so that when he has "completed" high school, all he can look back upon is twelve years of unrelieved confusion. He cannot express his thoughts with accuracy or correctness, his reading rate is well under two hundred words per minute (and he hates every word!) and thinks that writers and teachers are at best hokum artists and

at worst charlatans (a word which, if he knew it at all, he would misspell).

I should like now to suggest one way of dealing with this kind of student. It is a way that makes several assumptions. One is that such a student ought to be dealt with, even at the college level (he has been admitted, and he has paid his money). Another is that a student has the right to the best instruction he can get, which means for him instruction that he can learn from. And furthermore, such a student is not necessarily stupid (I define stupidity as inability to learn). Such assumptions do not imply a relaxation of normal college standards of correctness and clarity. Yet I should like to make one thing abundantly clear: any student who is unable to progress rapidly under the application of these techniques should be dropped from the college rolls as soon as possible.

First of all, the student should be assigned to a special section of not more than twenty, for which no credit should be given. His preliminary tests, whatever they may have been, have indicated that he is not yet ready to do college-level work in composition. This is his chance to improve his technique to the point at which he can do it. His instructor should be entirely sympathetic, but nevertheless exacting in the matter of standards of correctness.

Spelling should be taken up immediately, not only because it is the easiest to demonstrate to the student, but also because it is of itself a primary function. The instructor should point out that poor spelling is the result of inadequate or faulty technique. Comparisons may be made with other techniques that may be familiar to the student: no typist who uses the hunt-and-peck method can achieve the speed and accuracy necessary in business; no baseball player who bats cross-handed can be a successful hitter, even at the sand-lot level. Similar-

ly, the student whose ability to see and write words is faulty has little chance of succeeding in college—or in business or professional life. What he needs, therefore, is to acquire greater efficiency in spelling and hence in the use of those physical faculties which are involved in this particular process. He needs, in short, to acquire a new stance.

The instructor has to deal with the eyes, ears, hands, and ultimately, the mind of the student. This does not mean, to be sure, that he must presume to the offices of oculist, otologist, physiologist, and psychiatrist. But he does have to make the student realize that the word he sets on paper has resulted from the interworking of these faculties, and that if the student is to deal effectively with words, these faculties must be properly co-ordinated. Good co-ordination cannot be accomplished overnight, and the student must be made aware that what improvement he is able to achieve will be proportional to the consistency of his practice. This method depends almost solely upon the individual's initiative and diligence; the gains he makes from it are likely to be permanent.

The first step is to assign each student five words, preferably bisyllables. These may be selected at random, but I suggest that they be outside the normal vocabulary of the student (e.g., *lyddite*, *minion*, *scantling*). Each student is to look up these words in his dictionary and set them down in block capitals on a small card. Accent and syllabication should be slightly exaggerated: SEP' SIS, or separation by long hyphen may be used: TRO'-CHOID. If this copying has been carefully done (a student will frequently miscopy dictionary entries), he is ready to practice. He should first use his eyes, scanning each word by syllables, trying to fix the letter formations in his head; such photographing should be repeated until he is able to visualize

the word perfectly.

The second step the student should take is to go through his list again, this time pronouncing the words syllable by syllable, aloud and with exaggeration. After he has done this several times, he should visualize and pronounce without reference to his card, establishing as many links as possible between the sound and the graphic representation of it. It is important that the student study his list several times a day; several short sessions are better than one long session. Frequency of review is especially important at first, when the new habit is being established.

Not until the student feels that he has really "got" the words on his list should he attempt the third step: writing the words without reference to the card. He should write out all five words, then check them against the card. No spelling error should appear. If it does, he must keep working *on the entire list*, not merely on the word or words he missed.

When he is at last ready, he should go to his instructor for a hearing. This is the final step in the corrective process. The instructor will pronounce the words in a different order from that on the card, and the student will spell them back orally. Two unmistakable signs of progress should be looked for: assurance and speed. An error, or a halting, uncertain delivery, is indication enough that the student has not applied the method correctly or that he has not spent sufficient time on his word list. Should this occur, the instructor should require him to prepare a new list of words, make sure that he understands how he is to study them, and insist that nothing less than perfect fluency in those five words will be acceptable.

Most of the students with whom I have used this method have shown some improvement. Some show none whatever, and a few, although they make

some advance, fail to progress enough to meet course requirements. It is not difficult to spot such cases: after four or five weeks, their oral spelling of even simple words is likely to be just as wrong, just as halting, as it was at the outset. Some of these students are proper subjects for clinicians to deal with. I recall one boy whose defects showed up so early and so glaringly that his parents sent him to a clinic, where it was determined that his left eye scanned from left to right, but his right eye scanned backwards. This and other forms of dyslexia are perhaps more common than is ordinarily suspected, but it is obvious that the composition instructor is not the person to correct such deficiencies.

Those who are able to learn do so rapidly; they will quickly and confidently spell the words they have worked on. Instructors will immediately sense their assurance, and they in turn often reveal a shy pride in their accomplishment. When the instructor gets such a response, he may wish to "play by ear." As he hears their spelling, he may ask for related words, i.e., those with similar roots or letter groups. For instance, if the initial word is *lingual*, he might ask for *linguist*, *linguistic*, *lingulate*, *bilingual*, *linguiform*. Suffixes and prefixes may be worked on in the same way: *concede*, *confer*, *confidence*, *condone*; *decide*, *coincide*, *suicide*, *homicide*, etc.

Those who demonstrate speed and assurance in their practice on bisyllables should progress rapidly to multisyllables. These may be drawn from frequency lists, from their own errors, or at random. The instructor should look for increasing ability to "hold" a word in the mind without faltering over last syllables: the *TINE* of *clandestine* should be recited as vigorously as the *CLAN*.

Quite aside from the students' improvement in spelling, this method of-

ten leads to a solid establishment of the dictionary habit. These learners "discover" the uses of the dictionary as a carry-over of its employment for spelling, syllabication, and accent; whereas the better student may tend to regard it forever as a dreary though definitive reference work that he has to use from time to time—and as sparingly as possible. Furthermore, the poorer student sometimes develops a genuine interest in vocabulary; his instructor may find himself both pitying and marveling at the growing concern for words that his problem spell-

er often reveals.

I should be the last to assert that the method I have outlined is a panacea; all I can claim is that it has been successful with some students, and these have been able to complete their work in composition and to continue in college. And this, I would suggest, is the only criterion by which the method should be judged. I believe that many of the students who are committed to corrective courses in composition are worth saving. Perhaps the method I have sketched forth here will help save a few more.

On Teaching Teachers

ELLSWORTH BARNARD¹

This paper results from a panel discussion at the St. Louis meeting, along with Dudley Bailey's lively essay in the February (1954) CCCC. The present upsurge of concern for the quality of college English teaching, both in literature and composition, is overdue and should be welcomed. But let us not turn too hastily, in our eagerness to correct the oversight, to an elaborate curriculum for teacher training. Mr. Faust's proposal for a special Ph.D. program for all prospective teachers of composition and communication, stressing linguistics, anthropology, and other non-literary subjects, calls for a searching appraisal. My own immediate response is somewhat as follows.

First, it implies that you can teach teachers how to teach. And you can't. Suggested parallels with medicine and engineering do not hold. Teaching is not a science, it is an art. It has, and can have, no standard technique and no body of knowledge, aside from a particular subject matter, that can be specified as essential. Even the findings of the "New Linguists" (to coin a phrase which they

may not care for), which to me make sense and may ultimately ease our labors, should not blind us to the fact that good teaching of composition and communication has been and is being done by people versed only in traditional grammar.

This is not to disparage in-service courses for beginning instructors, carrying graduate credit, like those at Indiana and Kansas. Certain basic problems are faced in common by all teachers of composition, and knowledge of how experienced teachers meet them may save a good deal of initial wear and tear on the intellect and nerves of the novice. What sort of subjects to assign for themes, how to grade and criticize papers, how to deal with plagiarism (I think in terms of "composition," but my friends in "communication" can easily supply their own examples)—such onerous necessities, confronting the new recruit, give rise to soul-searchings and perhaps heart-burnings whose pain can often be alleviated by counsel from older colleagues. And particular difficulties are always arising that call for friendly advice and moral support.

But still, teachers are born and not

¹ Chicago 15, Illinois

made. Or if they are made, it is unconsciously, in ways too subtle to be prescribed. And first, they are born with *brains*—by which I mean, mainly, the power to *order* experience when they put it into words themselves and to perceive the order or lack of order in the utterances of others; to grasp firmly the relations among the facts, feelings, or thoughts which make up what a writer or speaker has to say. This—the first requisite of a successful teacher of composition—is a gift which apprentice teachers can be encouraged to cultivate in themselves and in their students; but it cannot be imparted to them by any sequence of courses.

And second, what every teacher must have and cannot be taught, in any ordinary way, is imagination: the ability to put himself into the position of his students, to comprehend the limits of their previous knowledge, to make allowances for the overwhelming influence on them of past and present experiences outside the classroom, to understand the conflict in them between faith and skepticism, between idealism and expediency. Behind each of the bored, the worried, the withdrawn, the determinedly gay, the attentively earnest, the unstudiedly eager faces of his students, he must recognize an individual human being whose character and destiny are (and not only to the student himself) unique.

And this perception cannot be impersonal, nor can the needs that it reveals be met by the latest gimmicks of the specialists in "group dynamics." What the teacher of freshmen needs most is not knowledge of the latest theories of psychology, but a quite unacademic sympathy with his students. This does not, to be sure, guarantee good teaching. One can recall rare instances where genuine good will, even affection, on the part of a teacher toward his students has been frustrated by other factors. But instances

of good teaching without good will are even rarer, if not non-existent. (The grace that saves the CCCC from being just another organization of English teachers is, I think, the fact that the unfeigned first concern of its members is the welfare of their students.)

Is a person born with this gift, also? Partly, no doubt, he is. But partly, also, he has acquired it unconsciously from his own teachers, from those who found him standing—perhaps hopeful, perhaps doubtful, perhaps appalled—upon the threshold of maturity, and companioned his uncertain quest for his particular rightful share of the best that has been thought and said in the world. It would be strange if such an experience did not draw him closer to the students in his own classroom. But it would be stranger still if anyone were to imagine that this sympathy could be artificially implanted.

And here may I say a word for "literature"—challenging the often implied assertion that the graduate school study of it is thrown away on prospective teachers of composition and communication? The testimony of the general run of Ph. D. theses and *PMLA* articles may be against me; but these are for the most part only premiums on a sort of academic life insurance, and all that anyone looks at is the signature on the check. Such evidence will hardly support a verdict of "Guilty in the first degree," at least without a recommendation of mercy. Even a mechanical treatment of great literature does not easily erase the impress of that literature upon sensitive minds. In the catacombs of the most spirit-dampening program for the Ph.D., anyone who is fit to be a teacher will discover works which will not only refine his verbal taste and sharpen his powers of reasoning but will, all cant and sentimentality aside, deepen his understanding of human nature and strengthen his hold upon traditional human

values. (That these ends of literary study might be as well or better achieved in other ways is a different argument, and possibly a more fruitful one.)

Do psychology and anthropology, after all, really do better than the Muse in brewing a liquor to inspire good teaching? Do methods courses really do more than Milton can to justify God's ways, as manifested in the freshman mind, to the freshman instructor? Is it quite beyond dispute that the "New Linguistics" has more to offer the prospective teacher than has the "New Criticism"—even though the practitioners of the latter sometimes tempt one to the retort of Job to his comforters: "No doubt but ye are the people, and wisdom shall die with you"?

If these questions seem loaded, let me say that I am not confronting anybody with an "either-or" choice. I am only suggesting, gently, that by setting up a detailed program with emphasis on teaching as a technique, we invite the same fall from grace that has overtaken the educationists; we grant the same fatal divorce between teaching and what is taught, we look to ritual and renounce life. How can we teach composition or communication to students if all we have to teach is "how to communicate"?

It may be said that such doubts are beside the point, since intelligence, enthusiasm, and other personal qualifications are presupposed. My answer is that they cannot be presupposed; that if they could, there would be no serious problem; and that the too common absence of them is in fact the main reason why we think more "preparation" is necessary. It is intended, along with recommended classroom procedures, to insure a minimum of competence in teachers of mediocre talents. But these recommendations gradually harden into requirements that are bars and fetters for the gifted. Success in teaching, as in any other art, is

impossible without freedom. Ends must be agreed on, means must be largely left to the individual. No teacher who consents to be confined by precepts in a textbook—which is what we are likely to come to—can be better than second rate. Above all else, a teacher must be himself, or he will never be able to kindle in his students the desire to be free-minded men and women. And without this desire, how can anything that deserves the name of education be possible?

One last question. Who are we, having entered, with middle age, the exalted circle of those who teach graduate courses and direct apprentice teachers, that we should presume to tell these young people how to teach freshmen, when they (despite forced detours through the byways of "research") are closer to their students than we can ever be again? We may be unaware of any change in ourselves, but we cannot escape an awareness of our changed relations with undergraduates. Where once we could meet them more or less on their own level, or perhaps persuade them that it was possible to meet us on ours, we find them now standing at a distance, respectful and apparently attentive, but neither giving nor inviting an exchange of confidence. Only youth can speak the language of youth. Only to young teachers are offered in unstinted measure the incomparable opportunities and rewards that can be found in the teaching of freshman composition (or "rhetoric" or "communication" or what you will).

We can all agree that some direct preparation for teaching is desirable, but we should not suppose that this goes to the root of the matter. If we want better teaching in composition and communication (not that it is poorer here than elsewhere, but it is never good enough), we must first of all find more effective ways of recruiting those persons who have a natural talent for this most exact-

ing of arts. And to do this we must invoke two further policies (at least). For one thing, we must reduce the sheer unmanageable numbers of students by which a beginning teacher's existence is often oppressed and embittered (and in direct proportion to his concern for his students' welfare). For another, we must make a demand—and make it stick—for honest endeavor on the part of adminis-

trators to discover good teaching and to reward it in tangible ways. Teachers do not live by bread alone, but they are entitled to more than the crumbs that fall from the tables set for "productive scholars" and promoters of "public relations."

All this is much more arduous than setting up a new Ph.D. program. It is also much more important.

Communication as Problem-Solving

ERWIN R. STEINBERG¹

Much of the confusion and poor communication in students' writing is a direct result of poor planning. The difficulty is really two-fold. Not only does the student fail to think through his topic to make sure that he knows what he is writing about, but he also does not differentiate in his own mind between the information he wishes to impart and the barriers he must overcome in order best to impart it. Both of these difficulties can be solved by teaching the student to plan any piece of writing by using the same approach that he would—or should—use in the solution of any other type of problem.²

In Step I of the problem-solving approach the student should thoroughly master the subject about which he is to

write. Often such mastery, or the demonstration of it, will include the writing of a "logical" outline.³ Thus, after having thoroughly mastered his subject, the student can order it, dividing it and subdividing it so that his outline indicates such things as the relative importance of the subdivisions and which ideas seem to him to lead logically to which others. Actually there is probably no such thing as a *best* logical outline because no two people understand any subject in the same way. Another factor to consider, too, is that people tend to organize subjects the way they learned them. Since not only people's perception but also their sources of information vary, even though they may be attending the same class, logical outlines will vary too, not only in content, but also in the ordering of that con-

¹ Carnegie Institute of Technology

² The reader should be warned at the outset that this discussion is for the instructor and not for the student, for whom an entirely different presentation should be planned. Probably the best use that the English instructor can make of the problem-solving method is to teach it inductively. The alternative would be to give the student the formula, feed several problems into it to show him how it works, and then demand that he demonstrate in ensuing problems that he has used the same method. Such an approach has many disadvantages. It has, as a start, all the same faults as has providing the student with an arbitrary set of grammatical rules and then demanding that he use them. And, further, verbalization of the formula can get between the student and the

problem. The student often becomes so conscious of the mechanism of the method that he begins to think in terms of formula and not of problem, and the very method given him to enable him to approach his problem more clearly may actually obscure his thinking. In the class room, attention should be focused on adequate communication rather than on method per se.

³ That is, the outline will be logical to the writer, but not necessarily to his prospective audience.

Although formal outlines are not actually necessary, we shall assume, for ease of discussion, that the student is required to write them for both Step I and Step II.

tent, and, possibly, in the conclusions drawn. In effect, then, in preparing an outline for Step I, the student should organize the material as he sees it, much as he would do were he preparing for himself an outline of the work covered during any unit of some course that he is taking. Indeed, one way of showing the student the importance of Step I is having him prepare such an outline as a preparation for explaining the material to someone else.

Step II calls for a completely new direction of thinking. When the student has mastered his material, he can then take into account the purpose of the paper which he is to write and the audience to whom it is to be addressed. All sorts of considerations may enter here: the educational, technical, or intellectual level of the audience; the interests of the audience; possible emotional blocks. Having considered these things and any others that may be relevant, the student will then be in a position to prepare an adequate outline (or make a plan) for writing a paper to accomplish his peculiar purpose. This second outline, unless the student is writing to or for himself or his intellectual twin, should be different from the outline prepared for Step I; for not only the inclusion or omission of specific items, but also the very ordering of ideas, should be dictated by the capacity of the particular audience. Inasmuch as the writer's job is to start where his audience is and to lead it where he wants it to go by taking into consideration and overcoming emotional and other obstacles, the ideas at the beginning of the outline for Step II will most probably not be the same as those at the beginning of the outline for Step I. The way the writer organized his information after having mastered his subject is probably not the best way to present it to a reader, since the reader will in all likelihood have a background different from the writer's.

Perhaps putting the two steps together in terms of an actual problem will best demonstrate this approach. Let us say I am engaged in explaining Existentialism first to a scientist, then to an historian, and finally to a business man. No matter what my audience, my proper first step would be to make sure that I myself understood Existentialism. Having completed Step I, I could then consider my audience. In explaining the philosophy to a scientist, I might well begin with the concept of relativity; to an historian, with Hegel and Kierkegaard; and to a businessman, with the ordinary frustrations of daily life.⁴ The information included in each paper would also be different, depending upon what I thought each individual would bring with him in information, experience, and attitude (that is, what I could take for granted and not have to make explicit and what I must overcome or change), and how much each individual could understand and would want to know. It might also be my purpose in writing to persuade my reader of the validity of Existentialist thinking. I should then want to be very careful not to alienate him by violating any of his pet taboos (religious, political, or social); or if my material by its very nature were likely to bruise tender sensibilities (as Existentialism well might), I should want to lay a very careful preparatory groundwork before I came to the ideas that I thought would be offensive. Having decided up-

⁴A simple way of dramatizing the importance of considering the reader in any writing or speaking situation is by giving a multiple assignment, in which the student must explain the same material to two or three different audiences. The instructor will, of course, choose audiences that will necessitate different approaches.

Another useful device is to make an assignment in two steps. The student can first be asked, for example, to explain Existentialism (actually Step I). When he has done so, he can then be asked to explain that philosophy to a specific reader (Step II). A discussion of the differences between the results of Step I and Step II will then make the need for keeping them distinct quite clear.

on a particular plan or approach for my particular paper, I should then be prepared to write (Step III), after which I should check my paper to see that my original purpose had been fulfilled (Step IV). Step V, in which the student generalizes on what he has learned in the solution of the problem so that he may apply this knowledge in the future should be added. Students can thus be made to understand that they can learn while they solve problems.⁵

The clear differentiation between Steps I and II in this discussion may have oversimplified this problem-solving approach to the point of making it seem a piece of arbitrary rigmarole—something upon which only unworldly English teachers insist. But it has been presented thus merely for clarity of understanding. Assuredly, one probably would not be called upon to explain Existentialism if he did not have more than a casual knowledge of it. In such an actual instance, Step I would not be as important as Step II since the writer would come to the problem with his information about that philosophy rather well organized; or stated in another way, Step I would have been completed, or perhaps almost completed, and Step II, planning the approach to suit the particular audience, would be the major concern. On the other hand, one might (and certainly Joe College some day will), as an accountant, be requested to make a study of the finances of a particular firm; or, as an engineer, to make a study of the possibility of producing a new product. If these reports were to be handed to other experts, Step I would be of prime im-

portance, since in writing for them a common fund of knowledge between writer and audience could be taken for granted. But if these same reports were to be prepared for a meeting of stockholders, most of whom would not be accountants or engineers, it would be as important for the expert making the study to understand (in all senses) his audience as it would be for him to understand the firm or process he studied. For if an expert has arrived at a conclusion of importance to a particular group but cannot communicate that conclusion and the reasons for it to that group, he has failed in the solution of his problem. Thus the relative difficulty and importance of Steps I and II in the solution of any writing problem may vary, but the need for going through both steps (and not just the motions) and the importance of keeping them separate from one another remains. And the students, in learning inductively this approach to problem-solving, should also learn the necessity for flexibility in using it. As an aid in this direction the instructor, in order to prevent the student from thoughtlessly manipulating a formula (Step I, Step II . . .), may decide not to teach the process in terms of a specific number of steps, but may prefer to develop in the student the habit of using the method without verbalizing it.

Thus the student of communication, working on meaningful problems, can be required to bring to bear in his writing the same professional skill and order in problem-solving that is expected of him in all his other work.⁶

⁵ The problem-solving approach would thus be:

- I. Define the problem and gather the material
- II. Plan the treatment according to the specific audience
- III. Write
- IV. Check
- V. Generalize

⁶ Actually the approach discussed above is an adaptation of the problem-solving method developed by a committee of the faculty of the Carnegie Institute of Technology for use in all courses.

For an application of the problem-solving technique to an engineering problem, see B. R. Teare, Jr., "Content and Method in Professional Education," in *Education for Professional Responsibility* (Pittsburgh: Carnegie Tech Press, Carnegie Institute of Technology, 1948).

The Principles and Practice of the Communication Course¹

THOMAS F. DUNN²

When the general education movement started in America in the 1930's, a number of colleges began to take a fresh look at, among a number of other things, their freshman English courses. During the Second World War, the term *communication* came into widespread use, largely from the impetus given by the special needs of war trainees whose preparation for receiving and giving military commands, making reports on activities, and directing operations both orally and in writing was not adequately provided by the traditional college training.

It so happened that in the twenties and thirties a number of publications were coming out that called attention to phenomena that had not been generally realized before, even among college teachers. These publications in linguistics, in semantics, in the psychology and philosophy of language highlighted the deficiencies of the current freshman program in English, which had been focussed on the teaching of correctness. Additional studies on teaching revealed the futility of trying to teach the use of a language by teaching its grammar—even more since the structuralist linguists were beginning to reveal the wrongness of the grammar taught by Lindley Murray beginning in 1795 and continuing with little change through the era of Curme and the multitude of handbooks of the first forty years of this century.

As a result of these developments, there came into being a number of new

courses to replace freshman composition, many of them called *communication*. They have been developed under the aegis of leaders here and there in different and special ways, with the result that no definition of, or description of, the courses that go under the name of "communication" can possibly fit all of them. Except as a particular man or course has been influential and has found imitators, no two so-called communication courses are alike. Nor is even the name *communication* common to all of them, for some have kept the old name while adopting new ways, and others appear to have adopted the name and little else.

In such a situation, it may be useful to give a sort of ideal concept of principles and practices as a means of groping for a common denominator of the programs and finding a rationale for the communication course. This is the aim of the following pages.

First of all, the communication course is a recognition of the fact that communication is itself a subject matter as well as an act or process. It is a subject matter that does not fit into any of the established academic departments in the college or university, but is rather the product of many disciplines. Among the chief studies it draws upon are those which developed out of the nineteenth century philology, itself a discipline now deceased in the presence of her children, linguistics and semantics. Other subject fields levied upon for the content of communication are the psychology of language and of learning; philosophy, especially the part which deals with the thought processes of the human mind;

¹ A condensation of a paper presented as part of a panel discussion, "Composition and Communication: A Contrast," March 4, at the 1954 CCCC Spring Meeting, St. Louis, Missouri.

² Drake University

and anthropology. New ways of thinking about our subject have come also from the new field of electronics, primarily through the medium of the new linguistics; and many other fields such as neurology have contributed their portion. Besides these fields from which communication makes direct levies, it readily spreads out to establish contacts with acoustics and related areas. One can scarcely look through a learned periodical in any one of a dozen areas today without coming across an article dealing with some aspect of communication, and probably more titles are appearing on it than on any other single topic.

This latter fact is abundant evidence that communication is a subject matter—a multi-discipline subject matter. And from this fact comes a corollary of the first principle stated. Being a subject matter and a constantly growing one, the study of communication requires the continuous acquisition of new data. Likewise, as new developments take place in any one or more of the contributory disciplines, the teaching of communication requires the constant development of new techniques of teaching and applying that data. Communication courses are therefore dynamic and continuously undergoing change.

A second consequence of the recognition of the fact that communication is a subject matter as well as an art is of pedagogical import. It is the operating principle that, since there is content to be learned about communication, all, or nearly all, of the exercises in the communication course are designated to lead the student to explore and learn that content as well as practice the art of communicating. It is inductive. This principle, when applied, lends a double utility to the communication course because it makes the student learn both a content and a skill, instead of essentially a skill only as in the traditional kind of

course. Thus the course acquires a status and a dignity in the curriculum equivalent to that of other courses in other departments of the liberal arts college. As a result, fewer academic colleagues, much less outsiders, tend to look down their noses at the communication teacher and his work. Pedagogically we like to think also that when a student learns a content out of which his skills are to grow, he will be able to acquire the skills more rapidly and effectively than if they are unrelated to a content.

The second cardinal principle beginning to affect communication teaching is drawn, by way of linguistics and semantics, from the new field of electronics. Communications engineers have found that they must distinguish between the code and the message. What passes over the telephone wire or the air wave is a patterning of signals, not a message at all. The message is what takes place in the mind of the hearer as the patterning is decoded. So linguists have to come to think of language as the code, a system of, or patterning of, signals. The process of listening to and reading a language is that of decoding for the message, as the process of forming words and sentences to speak is the speaker's encoding of the message. The study of communication, and the teaching of it, has accordingly adopted the principle of studying the code more directly and thoroughly rather than taking the code for granted, as in those courses that concentrate on the teaching of ideas, because communication people realize that the idea is a result of decoding, not an entity in itself.

Communication people have adopted this point of view as one of the new developments forced upon them by new approaches in contributing subject matters. The idea derived directly, as far as communication students are concerned, from the new linguistics, that is, the lin-

guistic science of the past two decades. In its own use of this approach, linguistic science has developed what is known as "structural linguistics." This phrase embodies the idea directly that language is a patterning or a structure of code signals. Most of the leading works in linguistic science today are structuralist studies, the best and simplest structuralist treatment of English grammar being C. C. Fries' *The Structure of English*. This work simply assumes that written English is a patterning of forms and positions, and that the description of English grammar can be best achieved by adhering to these two categories. Spoken English is characterized, in addition, by intonation. Parts of speech are recognized by their substitutability within a given frame or frames. Virtually all of the new and significant developments in linguistic study in the past twenty years have come about as a result of this approach.

While the teaching of communication does not involve the teaching of grammar directly, there are a great many ways in which the structuralist method results from the natural study of the code and can be very fruitful in teaching communication.

The examination of the language as code reveals that there are two basically different kinds of referents for substantive terms: signals for sensory phenomena and signals for non-sensory phenomena. This distinction is fundamental for any kind of clear thinking and is possibly the most important single thing we can teach our students to improve their writing and thinking processes. When we examine those signals that make reference to our experiences with sensory objects, we notice that they carry with them the idea of the generic.

The concept of the generic implies the biological notion of similarity based on essential physical characteristics, the

genus. It is this concept, embedded in these code signals, that we as teachers of communication can utilize to train students in sound and accurate generalization. Our students come to us with the habit of generalizing on single instances, on unlike relationships, on varying degrees of closeness of analogy, on personal attitudes and feelings, on inferences and prejudices. Their thinking is distorted, their logic is perverted, and their writing is discontinuous and sloppy. One of the finest things that we can do for them is to use the language of daily speech as an instrument of correcting these deficiencies in their thinking, writing, and speaking. Since statistics can deal only with similar items, we can also introduce the student to statistical concepts and the notion of probability.

This study of the generic concept embedded in the generic signal gives rise not only to a careful study of, and training in accurate generalizing, but also in the reverse process of abstracting. When one begins with a single member of a species, he generalizes the same term to cover and include other objects which his senses tell him possess the same essential physical characteristics. This is generalization, an essential activity of learning and thinking. On the other hand, when one has a number of specific members of the same genus, he abstracts to arrive at the generic concept—or generic word. This abstraction is the process of pulling out the characteristics common to all the members and omitting those, deemed incidental, that are not common to all. Not only is this another essential process of thought and language, it is the best means of teaching students the scientific process of definition.

Since generalization is an inevitable process of the human mind and the second essential step in every act of learning, we go on from the accurate kind of

generalizing outlined above to other instances of it. As one illustration we can deal, as students of language, with that form of generalizing which linguists call analogy. Here we teachers can draw on that admirable chapter on the subject in Sturtevant's *Introduction to Linguistic Science*. We can show the student how he expanded his language range by generalizing from a sentence pattern he heard as a child, using one particular noun, for example, to the same pattern or frame using another noun: *Please pass the sugar* to *Please pass the butter*. And while this is a safe or "sound" analogy, it is the same generalizing process that leads some people today to generalize from *show*, *showed* to *know* and *knowed* instead of *knew*; or from *walks*, *walked* to *see* and *seed*; from *mobilize*, *mobilization* to *analyze*, *analyzation*. This is a process of grammatical change which has occurred many times in the past. It is well for the student to understand his processes in speech.

The teacher of communication can go still further in his study of the ways of the code, and show how this generalizing process on the imaginative level leads the child to generalize from a round bright object in the sky to a round bright object approaching along the street and call both *moon*. This we know as the process of metaphor, an essential of language and especially of poetry. It is even possible by this approach of the communication course to develop in the student a power of making his own poetic metaphors as well as illuminating for him his daily speech habits and awakening an interest in imaginative expression.

Once the concept of the generic is clear to the student, the demands of communication lead to the study of those devices provided in the code for particularizing single members of a class or grouping. One of these is the gestural indi-

cation such as pointing and other forms of localizing in place and time. Another is by the use of special symbols such as proper names. A third is by qualifying the generic by other words to limit its reference. Going beyond the generic in the biological sense to the generic in the statistical or mathematical sense, we notice the number indications of the particular in serial numbers, page numbers, meter readings, measurements in various units, etc. These become the means by which society specifies the individual thing or other forms of exactness of reference: the bibliographical reference, items in orders of merchandise, exact dimensions, shapes, colors, sizes; individuals of this time and that place.

These signal devices in our language are actually means of exactness of discrimination and so of observation. Hence, when the communication teacher has familiarized the student with these instruments of precision in the code, he can proceed to have his students describe simple objects, persons, places, and scenes, both as discipline necessary in scientific communication and as aids in the kind of writing that pictures characters, actions, and settings in a story. In either kind of exercise, the student learns to use his senses more carefully and fully than before, to distinguish between sense data and his generalizations, inferences, and judgments, and above all to be exact. The exercise of describing a simple object which is common both to the composition and the communication course may help to distinguish the two approaches. The communication teacher feels that he gets a better job done and teaches more valuable incidental lessons by approaching the description through the medium of the language as signaling devices than by the traditional method.

When one goes into that large realm of words that do not name sense data of the particular or of the class, he arrives

at another sort of concept word such as *beauty*, or *goodness*, or *law*, terms which have often since Jeremiah Bentham been called *fictions*. Dealing with these, we can get the student to see what a different task confronts him in generalizing from that of the generic, and gradually he comes to realize its riskiness, its subjective quality, and the safeguards he must employ in generalizing to arrive at the notions in them. When the problem of definition confronts the student, he can begin to see why some dictionaries, for example, define *beauty* as "that which is beautiful," not only containing the essential word in the definition, that is, defining the word by repeating it, but shifting the concept from the quality to the object to which it is ascribed. When the student is asked to write a paper using generic terms, and then rewrite it, saying the same thing in fiction terms only (a trick assignment), he realizes fully that he is dealing with two different kinds of concepts. He almost comes to appreciate Quiller-Couch's famous cliché: "How vile a thing is the abstract noun; it wraps a man's thoughts around like cotton-wool." These two kinds of concept words provide the communication teacher with a finer classification of types of non-fictional prose not distinguished in traditional composition. Writing which confines itself to verifiable statements about particular and generic concepts he calls *factual prose*, and writing which deals with concepts labeled by fictions he calls *exposition*. It is a useful discrimination.

These essential distinctions in the code and their implications for thinking as well as communication are treated briefly, along with others, in an admirable article in *Word* for December, 1953, by that greatest of contemporary semanticists, Stephen Ullmann. Teaching these distinctions is the best means I know of helping our students not only to com-

municate better and more accurately, but to avoid some of the pitfalls so common in our mass dissemination of half-truths and propaganda. Students can come to see that some generalizations have little to offer but glitter, and that name calling is not only the child's faulty generalization but the emotive fiction as well.

Another field that has adopted the strategy of studying the code rather than the message is dearer to the heart of the average freshman teacher than semantics—the new criticism. Not all the new critics seem to know that their stimulus derives from the semantic-linguistic developments, but a number have openly acknowledged I. A. Richards and W. M. Urban as inspiration. The work of Roman Ingarden, perhaps the most significant of the philosophers of the new criticism, is apparently directly related to the new linguistics. The newest type of study coming out of this school is illustrated by J. J. Lynch's analysis of "On First Looking into Chapman's Homer" in *Word* for December, 1953. Cleanth Brooks' sometimes brilliant and sometimes erratic analyses of metaphors are directly an application of the code approach as are the numerous similar other studies. Of special note is the work of William Empson. A portion of his method is to study the possible range of code significations at the time of a given work, and thus discover the range of the message and its ambiguity. This is a direct linguistic analysis of a work.

The communication course can make use of these models of literary study. A student can be set to the collecting and analyzing of metaphors in a work, or collecting and analyzing metaphors in a particular medium or level of speech, just as speech and literary journals do. He can be set to studying sentence patterns and their distribution; rhyme variations in such a work as *The Ancient*

Mariner or metrical distribution in *Christabel* or any modern poem. For a research paper it would seem that the use and form of footnotes in a given journal or group of journals would be an excellent task for a student to precede and exercise his own use of them. After all, we do such studies in our own writing of texts and critical papers. And every time a student analyzes someone else's practice, he has the basis for successful imitation of that model and should be set to doing it at once.

This brings us to the third principle of the communication course: that which gives it its organization and its psychological validity. Psychologists tell us, and we know from our observation of children, that all learning, which for us means language learning, is by imitation. That is, a child learns to speak by copying the actions of those around him who can already speak, and our students come to college with the speech habits of their community and the writing habits of the reading they have done most extensively, somewhat modified, of course, by their speechways.

Psychologists tell us, further, that there are four conditions essential to the learning process. First, there must be a drive, a motivation. Second, the student must recognize a cue as to how he may satisfy that urge or desire. Third, he must respond to the drive, and, fourth, receive a reward for his response. Now the course in communication—in listening, reading, speaking, and writing—fits naturally as a fulfillment of these four conditions. At the same time, we are applying those very principles which linguistic scholars have for years urged as the means for learning to use well any language: observation and imitation. Thus the psychology of learning and modern linguistics provide us our course organization and lead us at the same time to the adoption of these practices which

make learning efficient. We begin our course with training the student to listen, then to see, then to imitate in speech and writing what he has observed. Actually, however, the listening and looking must continue as lifetime habits, and imitation or practice must begin at the very outset of the course with the first observation.

In communicating, the drive is the desire for co-operation, since the purpose of all communication is to secure co-operation. Broken down into its components the desire for co-operation consists of three parts. The first divides into two subdivisions: (a) the imparting of information for the securing of services, or (b) asking a question or making a request as direct means of securing co-operation. Second, the purpose of communication is to seek a common shared attitude towards some person, thing, or situation; and third, communication exists for the purpose of securing a favorable attitude towards the communicator. The presence of this desire is the necessary drive. The prestige of a college education and the status enjoyed by the good talker and writer are evidence for the existence of a drive among our students to improve their communication, though we must do all we can to intensify the desire to learn.

Before that drive can manifest itself in energy directed to his satisfaction, according to the psychologists, the speaker must discover a cue to the kind of response that will lead to satisfaction. In speech situations that cue is to be discovered by listening and looking. Since improvement in one's speechways involves listening to the speech of others, we attempt to train the student in some elements of the linguist's field methods. These field methods (nothing more than careful listening) sharpen the student's hearing for grammatical form and sequence, intonation, enunciation, pronun-

ciation; for words and phrases that are substitutable for other words and phrases, and for sentence patterns. So again the communication teacher borrows from the linguist. And as he does so, and trains the student in drawing inductive conclusions about usage, intonation, strategies in varying types of situations, he is joining the natural and social scientist in inductive observation of data, and in inductive reasoning.

When the student begins to look and listen for the cue as to *what* to say in response, he first looks, if he is so taught, for contextual clues. These may be items in the physical setting, body gestures and muscle sets, and tones of voice and intonations; or they may be in other words such as qualifying clauses. He also can be taught in his training as a listener to look for organizational clues, transitional clues, and other clues to the speaker's strategy. He can be made conscious of such items of strategy as generalizations, emotional appeals, specific facts, etc. Note-taking as a method of recording these data is a part of this training.

In training the student in the reading portion of the course, such matters as contextual clues again become an important part of the subject matter. Here the clues are all verbal and include library card catalogues and references, titles, title pages of books, tables of contents, introductions, topic paragraphs and sentences, qualifying clauses, formal structure, lexical and other clues to intonation, and all the verbal means of identifying locale and action. These items likewise are psychological cues to condition the drive towards an intelligent response. Note-taking as a method of recording data is here also a part of the field methods and training.

The third condition for learning, as specified by the psychologists, is the response itself. This is the student's own speaking in recitation, panels, or plat-

form performances, and his various attempts at writing. If the training in observation has been thorough, then the responding, that is, his imitating practices that he has heard and read, can quickly become reasonably effective. We need only to aid him in selecting models to imitate. The success in the communication is the natural reward for the response, and the drive achieves some satisfaction. Continued practice increases the effectiveness of the response and likewise the ensuing reward.

To summarize. First, it is the communication teacher's belief that communication is a subject matter as well as an art. Because it is a subject matter, we believe that student assignments should be directed so that the student learns something of the subject in preparing his lessons as well as practicing what he learns in so doing. Because communication is a subject contributed to by many disciplines, we think that the teacher must always be studying the new data and adapt his course to new developments in the related fields.

Second, the principal new development in our contributory sciences in recent years has been the realization that the study of communication is in reality the study of the code as vehicle of the message, rather than taking the code for granted and concentrating on the message. In actual practice, communication teachers, in common with linguists and literary critics, find this the most useful approach, both in the effectiveness of their teaching and in the establishing of useful links between communication and other academic fields.

Third, communication teachers find a correct appraisal of the communication process as a circuit, requiring listening, reading, speaking, and writing. This enables them to utilize the generally accepted principles of the psychology of learning so that their teaching can hope for

the maximum efficiency in terms of the student's learning. Further, in thus fitting their course organization into the requirements of the psychology of learning, they are automatically integrating their methods and materials with still other subject matter fields in the liberal

arts curriculum. By so doing, they broaden the base and the utility of their course.

Thus the communication course is grounded in modern learned disciplines, and because it is an integration of subject matter as well as a skill, it is a thorough-going general education course.

The Idea of the Freshman Composition Course — A Polemical Discussion¹

HERMANN C. BOWERSOX²

There is general agreement that the average college student is unable to write clear, correct, and readable prose; there is no agreement as to the cause of this phenomenon or its remedy. In recent years, it has become academically fashionable to blame the freshman composition course. Its most vigorous critics have been the communicationists, who assert that the course fails to teach the student how to write because its purpose is to impose upon his natural language an artificial correctness, teach him a confused and unscientific grammar, and train him in empty, mechanical skills, and because it operates by requiring him to fill in exercise blanks, memorize formulae, and write meaningless themes. Naturally, such a course would be without effect, save to instill in the student an abiding hostility to composition. To replace it, the communicationists offer a different kind of course, one which, in their opinion, is firmly grounded on scientific principles of language and communication, employs the most modern pedagogical methods, and is dedicated to the noblest of academic and social goals.

I am unable to accept any of these opinions. I hold that the supposed fail-

ures of the freshman composition course are more properly viewed as unreasonable notions of what any writing course, faced with similar problems and taught under similar conditions, can hope to accomplish; that although freshman composition is often badly taught, the idea of the course is sound; and that the communication course, in so far as it is different from the composition course, is inferior to it.

The freshman composition course may seem to fail because too much is expected of it. In many institutions, the freshman English staff consists chiefly of graduate students working for the Ph.D. or of newly made Ph.D.'s struggling to publish before their three-year contracts expire and a sprinkling of older teachers with tenure who, in the judgment of the chairman, are not qualified to teach above the sophomore level. The young are too inexperienced or too busy advancing themselves professionally to teach well; the others, even if they are not really incompetent, are likely to be apathetic because of professional frustration. And if an individual teacher manages to bring skill and enthusiasm to the classroom, what confronts him there dismays all but the most dedicated teachers. Many, or even most, of his students may be ignorant of standard usage; at best, they will write correctly but will be

¹ A condensation of a paper presented as part of a panel discussion, "Composition and Communication: A Contrast," March 4, at the 1954 CCCC Spring Meeting, St. Louis, Missouri.

² Roosevelt University

unable to compose intelligible discourse of any degree of complexity or maturity. Eight semesters of concentrated work on writing, the teacher feels, would be hardly enough time to remedy such deficiencies, yet he is expected to accomplish this miracle in only two—and to do so, moreover, often without very much help from his colleagues in other departments, who may give passing grades—even top grades—to the confused, semi-literate pieces of writing their students hand in, or who require no written work whatsoever from their students. Such indifference to competent writing encourages the student in his natural belief that the principles of composition taught in the freshman English class are merely the incomprehensible notions of English teachers, to be tolerated for two semesters and then forgotten. Laboring under such handicaps, the freshman English course must be content with modest achievements.

The communicationists reject such an explanation of why the freshman composition course does not accomplish more. In their opinion, the reason is not inadequate teaching and lack of academic co-operation, but the course itself—its absurd aims and ridiculous methods. Such a view of the composition course is evidence that the communicationists have failed to grasp what the course, properly conceived and properly taught, is all about.

Freshman composition is a course in rhetoric, which, in Genung's words, is "the art of adapting discourse, in harmony with its subject and occasion, to the requirements of a reader or hearer." Its primary aim is practical—to provide the student with skill in the production of the kind of discourse, chiefly exposition and argument, that he needs in his other classes and in later life; hence, the theoretical principles underlying that skill are brought into the course, not as

ends in themselves, but as means to enlighten and direct practice. To achieve this fusion of knowledge and skill, the course relies chiefly upon two kinds of exercise: the rhetorical analysis of prose passages, which teaches the student how particular problems of discourse have been solved by others, and various kinds of writing assignments, which give him practice in solving similar problems of discourse. The rhetorical problems that the student encounters in his reading and writing exercises have two aspects—one relating to thought, the other to expression. There can be no discourse without thought about a subject matter—the discovery or invention of material, the perception of relationships among the data, the making of inferences, the construction of patterns of organization; and if that subject matter is to be communicated, it must be expressed in suitable words, sentences, and paragraphs. In dealing with matters of thought, the course touches upon logic; with matters of expression, upon such varied sciences as grammar, semantics, and psychology; and successful composition occasionally produces something akin to poetry. Such are the ramifications of the freshman composition course, the immediate purpose of which is to train the student to handle the writing problems he meets in his other courses.

The major work of the course, as I have said, consists of reading and writing exercises. The rhetorical analysis of a prose passage operates on the assumption that a well-written discourse is a structure of articulate elements whose presence and order are determined by principles deriving from the subject matter of the discourse and its adaptation to an audience. Its purpose is to exhibit the various elements in a discourse as interlocking parts in a complex whole. It is concerned with questions of content, but only as a basis for dealing with

questions of form. That is, it asks, "What does the author say?" so that it may then ask, "Why does he say this rather than something else?" and "Why does he say it here and in these words?"

These generalizations about rhetorical analysis may be illustrated by considering a typical reading exercise based upon the following paragraph:

(1) When I was a boy, there was but one permanent ambition among my comrades in our village on the west bank of the Mississippi. (2) That was, to be a steamboatman. (3) We had transient ambitions of other sorts, but they were only transient. (4) When a circus came and went, it left us all burning to become clowns; the first Negro minstrel show that even came to our section left us all suffering to try that kind of life; now and then we had the hope that, if we lived and were good, God would permit us to be pirates. (5) These ambitions faded out, each in its turn; but the ambition to be a steamboatman always remained.

One way to discover the structure of this paragraph is to ask the student to alter individual sentences in some particular way and then to explain how well his sentence fits the paragraph. For example, he may be asked to give the first sentence compound structure (a task he can perform only if he is familiar with the various sentence forms and experienced in converting sentences from one form to another). Suppose he changes the sentence to read: "I grew up in a village on the west bank of the Mississippi, and among my comrades there was but one permanent ambition." His next step is to point out the inferiority of this sentence to Mark Twain's—grammatically, in that it lacks unity; rhetorically, in that it is not congruent with the rest of the paragraph, the sentence placing equal em-

phasis on growing up and having a permanent ambition, the rest of the paragraph dealing only with ambitions, permanent and transient. If the student grasps this point, he will see why dividing his compound sentence into two sentences (which eliminates its disunity) does not enable it to perform its proper function in the paragraph. More difficult questions of proportion and emphasis are raised by considering the effect of combining the first two sentences into a single complex sentence and of reducing the third sentence to a complex or a simple sentence. Mere grammatical skill will enable the student to effect such transformations, and without that skill he cannot do more; but rhetorical skill is needed to explain why Mark Twain's sentences function better than the altered versions. Matters of tone may be raised by asking the student to justify the expletive in the first sentence, and to consider the effect of substituting synonyms for "burning" and "suffering" and of omitting "if we lived and were good." No formulae like "more colloquial" or "more vivid" are adequate answers to such questions; the only satisfactory answer is one that shows how Mark Twain's sentence structure and his choice of words and details express certain consistent attitudes towards his subject matter and audience.

Such exercises in "critical rhetoric" (usually dealing with larger pieces of discourse) provide the student with a necessary understanding of rhetorical principles; writing exercises enable him to apply that knowledge in solving many different kinds of writing problems and thus to develop a general writing skill. Writing exercises are of two kinds—themes (both "free" and "controlled") which, though limited in scope and form, necessarily present the student with a variety of kinds of writing problems, and brief technical exercises aimed at giving

the student practice in solving particular kinds of writing problems.

Let us examine a specific theme assignment to see some of the kinds of thinking and writing skill that are needed to handle it. This is a "controlled" theme assignment in which the student is given three pages of notes that provide him with all the data he needs to write a paper explaining how technological changes in the cotton industry caused a breakdown of the system of Parliamentary representation in 19th-century England. The student is to write either as though he were answering a question on a history examination or as though he were an American student visiting England at the time of the agitation for Parliamentary reform and were writing an article for his college magazine. In order to use this material, the student must first be able to think about it as history—that is, to grasp the significance of the various items of information in the data sheets. This involves various kinds of thinking: classifying data about the invention and improvement of certain machines into information relative to machines used to run other machines, and information relative to machines employed directly in the manufacturing of cotton; judging that since the system of Parliamentary representation as it operated in the 17th century provided for the representation of the major social and economic groups, it was a reasonably satisfactory system; perceiving causal sequences—how the development of power-driven machines shifted cloth production from home to factory and (because of certain geographical factors) from southern to northern England, how this shift (in conjunction with the fact that English farming at the time was marginal) caused a shift in population from southern to northern England, and how this shift of population (in conjunction with the fact that the provisions for Parlia-

mentary representation were fixed for 17th-century conditions) resulted in a breakdown of Parliamentary representation in the 19th century. After the student has grasped the meaning of the items of information on his data sheets, he must organize his material. He is limited in his patterns of organization by his data (strict chronological order of this material is not possible) and by his initial assumptions about audience and occasion. If he chooses to write as though he were answering an examination question, he may, for example, begin with an account of Parliamentary representation as it existed either in the 17th or the 19th century; if he chooses to write as though he were a 19th-century reporter, then he is limited to beginning with an account of the current agitation for Parliamentary reform and of the current state of Parliamentary representation. When he has solved the problems of over-all organization, he runs into a new order of difficulties, the solution of which calls for writing skill in the narrow sense of the term—the kind of skill that comes into play during the actual writing process. Such writing skill, which has to do with the construction of paragraphs and sentences that function as structural units and with the selection of words that carry an appropriate meaning and tone, is independent of skill in the interpretation and organization of data. To help the student acquire this kind of writing skill, technical exercises, in addition to themes, are useful. These exercises are directed at increasing the student's skill in such specific matters as writing various kinds of paragraphs (introductory, developing, linking), joining particulars to generals, expanding or contracting material, adapting material to different audiences or shaping it to different ends, and so on.

The composition course, it should be evident from this brief statement of its

aims and procedures, is very different from the monstrous course that it is often represented to be. It is concerned, not with an artificial correctness, but with standard English; naturally, opinions may vary as to what, in any given instance, standard English is. It is concerned with traditional grammar because it finds that grammar truly functional. It is concerned with writing skills that are not "empty" but essential to education, and not "mechanical" but requiring the highest kind of intelligence and judgment. And to train the student in this kind of knowledge and skill, it uses appropriate methods—a limited amount of drill on points of grammar and usage, and a great many different reading and writing exercises.

The communication course differs from the composition course in two important respects. First, it is a comprehensive or "fused" skills course, in which speaking and listening (and sometimes "observation" and "demonstration") are taught as well as reading and writing, on the assumption that speaking, listening, reading, and writing are four related, but nevertheless separate, communication skills, which are most effectively and most "naturally" taught in a single "integrated" course. Second, it is also a subject-matter course treating semantics, linguistics, literature (sometimes), and enough social science to enable the student to comprehend the "social and economic forces affecting the mass media of communication." This introduction of subject matters into the course is justified on two grounds: that it facilitates the acquisition of the skills; and that, in the words of *The English Language Arts*, it "provide[s] the student [not merely] with those skills, [but also with those] attitudes and modes of behavior which he needs to become an effective adult citizen in a democratic society." In my opinion, neither of these differences con-

stitutes an improvement, and both of them rest upon faulty assumptions and mistaken reasoning.

The division of communication into the co-ordinate skills of reading, writing, speaking, and listening obscures significant functional differences in the process of communication and the common principles underlying these differences. On the basis of function, these four skills divide into two groups: reading and listening, concerned with the comprehension of discourse, and writing and speaking, concerned with its production; their common principles are those of rhetoric. This being the case, to train the student to read and write is, at the same time, to give him the basic principles of listening and speaking. Now, to be sure, more than rhetorical skill is required for speaking and listening, the former raising problems of voice production and self-confidence, the latter, problems of attention. But these are physiological and psychological problems that have no relation to rhetorical problems, and thus are best handled in a separate course or incidentally in the composition course. Theoretically, either written or spoken discourse might serve as the material for freshman English; its emphasis upon written discourse is due to practical reasons: spoken discourse vanishes instantly and thus cannot readily be examined; furthermore, if all student discourse were to be oral, each student in the average freshman class would have only a few minutes a week to exercise his skill in the production of discourse.

The first argument offered in support of combining subject matters and skills in the same course—that such a course is more efficient in teaching skills than a mere skills course—seems to rest upon the assumption that the composition course attempts to impart skill in some abstract manner, without the use of any subject matter. As we have seen, this

view is completely erroneous, for the composition course teaches the student to write by asking him to solve concrete problems of reading and writing, which treat of any subject matter that the student may reasonably be expected to comprehend. Naturally, the formal teaching of these subject matters is left to experts in other departments, for making use of a subject matter does not oblige one to give a course in it. Furthermore, it is not apparent why the communication course elects to teach the subject matters it does. Imaginative writing is quite unlike the writing the student must do in his other classes; the economics and sociology of the mass media of communication have no more relation to writing skill than do the economics and sociology of any other agencies in our society. And semantics and linguistics, which may seem to have a special relevance, stand in about the same relation to writing skill as do logic and psychology. The composition course teaches relevant aspects of these sciences in an *ad hoc* manner. To make any of them an object of special study, as does the communication course, is to confuse knowledge about a subject matter that impinges upon writing skill with that skill itself. The prominent linguists, semanticists, logicians, and psychologists who write badly are proof that the two are not identical.

The second argument for combining subject matters and skills in the communication course—that such a course more adequately provides “those skills, attitudes, and modes of behavior” necessary for citizenship in a democracy—rests upon strange notions of ends and means in education. Presumably the study of a skill leads only to the acquisition of that skill. This seems to be the basis for the charge that the composition course is “inadequate”: since it is a “mere” skills course, it cannot provide the student with democratic “attitudes

and modes of behavior”; and since, in the opinion of *The English Language Arts*, it is almost exclusively concerned with writing, it cannot even provide him with all “those skills” needed for effective citizenship. (A further implication is that the four communication skills are all the skills needed.) If the communication course succeeds where the composition course fails, it must do so by virtue of its differences from that course—by the fact that it is a “fused” skills course, and that it is also a subject-matters course. If the study of a skill leads only to the acquisition of that skill, then it must be the subject matters taught in the communication course, either alone or in conjunction with the communication skills, that are regarded as providing the student with the “attitudes and modes of behavior” needed in a democratic society. Precisely how the study of semantics, linguistics, and the economics and sociology of the mass media of communication is to effect such a result *The English Language Arts* does not make clear; perhaps it is merely indulging in grandiose statements of ends without considering the means to their achievement.

Though not all communicationists think that there is any necessary connection between the subject matters of their course and democratic “attitudes and modes of behavior,” they do regard those subject matters as conferring upon the course “a status and a dignity in the curriculum equivalent to that of other courses in other departments of the liberal arts college.” I do not know by what standard of values a subject-matter course is entitled to more prestige than a course whose aim is to teach a necessary skill that requires for its successful exercise the sharpest intelligence and the most discriminating judgment. Perhaps such an opinion rests upon a confusion of the aims of a general education program with the aims of a particular

course in that program. Since general education is directed at personal and social development rather than at vocational or professional competence, it may be felt that courses limited to particular skills or subject matters are too restricted in aim to achieve the broad ends of general education, and that only courses which attempt to "fuse" or "integrate" a variety of skills and subject matters can properly do the job. The effect upon freshman English of such an identification of the contributions of one course to general education with that education

itself may be easily guessed. If freshman English is to teach the average freshman, not merely the rudiments of intelligible discourse (an overwhelmingly difficult task in itself), but also a variety of subject matters, each of which needs at least a semester for the presentation of its basic principles, then it will surely keep him mightily busy, but at the end of the semester it is not likely to leave him with either a usable skill or a coherent knowledge of any subject matter whatsoever.

CCCC Bulletin Board

In accordance with the provisions of the CCCC Constitution, Article IV, Section 3, "The Editorial Committee," two members of the CCCC Editorial Board retire each year and two new members are appointed. Retiring at the end of 1954 were Stewart S. Morgan, of The Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas, and Samuel Weingarten, Chicago City Junior College, Wright Branch. Deep and sincere appreciation is hereby expressed for their services to *College Composition and Communication* during their term of office. We welcome, as their successors on the Editorial Board, Glenn J. Christensen, of Lehigh University, and Howard H. Dean, of Montana State College.

The Executive Committee of the National Council of Teachers of English has approved for a trial period a plan for a comprehensive subscription to Council publications. A school, library, or individual purchasing such a subscription will receive one year of *Elementary English*, *The English Journal*, *College English*, and *College Composition and*

Communication, and in addition all pamphlets and books published by or for the Council during the subscription year. The price is \$15.00 a year.

At the annual business meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English in Detroit, November 25, 1954, four amendments to the NCTE Constitution and By-Laws were passed. Two of these concern the CCCC and are designed to implement further the close relationship between NCTE and CCCC—as follows (italics stress the CCCC material):

Article VI, Section A, paragraph 2: "Council officers, chairmen of the three sections, *three members to be elected by the Conference on College Composition and Communication*, all chairmen and associate chairmen of Council committees, and one person designated by each affiliated association as its liaison officer to the Council shall be members ex officio of the board of directors of the Council."

Article VII, Section B, paragraph 1: "Each section shall have a steering committee known as the section committee,

consisting of seven members each serving for three years, three to be elected in 1946 and in each third year thereafter, and two elected in each other year, *except that, beginning in 1955, the college section shall elect only two members each year, the seventh member to be elected by the Conference on College Composition and Communication in 1955 and each third year thereafter.*"

The B. C. Quarterly, with the subtitle "A Selection of Student Writing in Basic Communication," is published at the University of Utah. In size, $5\frac{1}{2} \times 8\frac{1}{2}$ inches, number of pages about twenty-four, method of printing, offset—the magazine contains the work of students in the upper thirty percent, chosen by entrance test. Most of the editing is done by the instructional staff, although some preliminary selection may be done by students. It is given free to students in Basic Communication.

In the spring of 1954 Indiana University experimentally offered what may have been the first course in English Composition to be televised. Taught by Professor Harold Whitehall, the course was given in co-operation with the Indiana University Program in Linguistics, the Departments of English, Radio and Television, Division of Adult Education and Public Services, the School of Education, and Television Station WTTV, Bloomington, Indiana. It carried a special designation (W101t) to distinguish it from the regular on-campus course, had its own syllabus and texts, and its own methodology.

Participation in the course was of three types. In the first, students already admitted to the University but not enrolled for work on the Bloomington campus were enrolled through the I. U. Corres-

pondence Study Bureau; such students paid a fee of \$16 and received credit on the same basis as those in regular courses. Enrollees were required to complete assignments in home study and writing as specified in the syllabus, and to take a written final examination either on campus or under supervision by a specially appointed educator in their communities. For them the course was essentially a regular correspondence course with television broadcasts largely as supplemental aids to learning. Viewing the telecasts, however, was made a part of the assignments, which could be more satisfactorily handled to the degree that the subject matter of the telecasts was absorbed.

The next two types of participation were offered to high school students. The first was a formal participation by those students who fulfilled a set of minimum requirements; they paid a fee of \$5 and received a Certificate of Participation. The other consisted in an informal participation by students who merely audited the programs. Altogether, twenty-one high schools arranged to receive the telecasts; integration with their own courses of instruction was a matter of local decision. An inter-departmental advisory committee was set up to furnish guidance and evaluation for the further development and improvement of such high school liaison programs; and to this end also weekly reports were requested from the high school teachers, covering technical aspects of reception, course content and method, and problems of integration with high school instruction.

The course—its aims, content, organization, and methods—was the sole responsibility of the instructor. The Radio and Television Service lent its technical skills to afford the most effective and interesting visual presentation possible. Success in televising the course meetings depended on careful planning by the instructor

and the television producer, planning that began months before the first telecast and continued day by day. (PHILIP R. WIKELUND)

A course in clear writing, by way of television, is being taught during the winter term at Michigan State College over Michigan State College's station WKAR-TV. A ten-week course aimed primarily at high school students who intend to enter college, it stresses the positive aspects of effective expression: being specific, using personal experiences, and

observing carefully. A syllabus, which has been mailed to all enrolled students, includes an initial diagnostic test and a final achievement test, modeled on representative entrance tests at Big Ten universities and Michigan colleges. Professor William D. Baker of the Michigan State Basic College, The Department of Communication Skills, is in charge of the course. He is being assisted by guest speakers from his department who will discuss such topics as "Using the Dictionary," "Avoiding Cliches," "Theme Revision," "Grading Themes," and "Writing Essay Exams."

Secretary's Report No. 12

GEORGE S. WYKOFF¹

Minutes, Meeting of Executive Committee, Conference on College Composition and Communication, Room 1310, Hotel Statler, Detroit, Michigan, Thursday, November 25, 1954, 12 noon to 3:30 p.m. Chairman T. A. Barnhart, presiding. Members present: Archer, Dale, Griggs, Maurice Hatch (representing George Faust), Hodges, Hook, Lawson, Lefevre, Salisbury, Shoemaker, Tuttle, Van Gelder, Wykoff, Young.

1. Considerable informative discussion occurred, under the leadership of Irwin Griggs, Assistant Chairman and Program Chairman for the 1955 Spring Meeting, to be held at the Hotel Morrison, Chicago, on Thursday, Friday, and Saturday, March 24, 25, 26. Discussion concerned details of the program for that meeting, the general plan for which calls for two general sessions, nine panel discussions, seventeen workshops, and a closing luncheon meeting.

2. Falk Johnson, Local Chairman for the 1955 Spring Meeting, reported on

progress to date. A motion was passed concerning the prices to be charged book exhibitors.

3. Regarding the status of the CCCC in the NCTE, J. N. Hook, Executive Secretary of the NCTE and CCCC Treasurer, called attention to the amendments to the NCTE Constitution (see October, 1954, *College English*) and said that another amendment to the NCTE Constitution was being prepared to give CCCC permanent status within the NCTE. He asked for suggestions from the members of the CCCC Executive Committee concerning the wording and content of the proposed amendment. (NOTE: This amendment will replace the present policy by which—since 1949—CCCC has been a "group" within the NCTE for three-year periods, re-confirmed by the NCTE Executive Committee at the end of each three-year period).

4. Jerome Archer as chairman of the Committee for the Revision of the CCCC Constitution submitted a draft containing the proposed revisions. These were accepted by unanimous vote, and will be

¹ Secretary pro tem.

submitted to the membership, by mail ballot, for their action.

5. It was moved, seconded, and passed that the CCCC Chairman investigate the desirability of a permanent CCCC Membership Committee: to follow up members whose membership lapses, to list and approach all new possibilities for individual and institutional memberships, to plan a campaign for library subscriptions, and the like.

6. The CCC Editor reported briefly that the four issues of *College Composition and Communication*, Volume V, 1954, will total 180 pages.

7. Francis Shoemaker and Carl Leffevre reported on plans for the 1956 Spring Meeting: place, New York City; hotel, The Statler; dates, Thursday, Friday, and Saturday, March 22, 23, 24. The report was approved.

8. William Sutton, Ball State Teachers College, detailed plans for visits to various Indiana colleges during a quarter's leave of absence, to gather informa-

tion concerning the professional status of the composition/communication teacher. This will be a pilot-plan study and is part of the activities and research of the CCCC Committee on the Professional Status of the Composition/Communication Teacher.

9. There was discussion of the need of an up-to-date version of our information booklet, *CCCC Facts*. Discussion brought out that this booklet could be prepared during the coming year, when the revised version of the Constitution has been considered and a six-year history of the CCCC has been written.

10. A panel of fourteen names was presented by the CCCC Editor, and was approved. When the NCTE Executive Committee approves this panel, two people will be chosen from it for the CCCC Editorial Board, to replace two Editorial Board members retiring this year. This action is in line with the provisions of the CCCC Constitution, Article IV, Section 3, "The Editorial Committee."

Secretary's Report No. 13

GEORGE S. WYKOFF¹

Minutes, Annual Business Meeting, Conference on College Composition and Communication, Friday, November 26, 1954 (luncheon meeting), Founders' Room, Hotel Sheraton-Cadillac, Detroit, Michigan. Chairman T. A. Barnhart, presiding. Number present: 175.

1. Chairman T. A. Barnhart expressed for the group our appreciation to Leslie L. Hanawalt, Wayne University, and his committee for their time and trouble in arranging details for this impressive CCCC luncheon.

2. The Secretary's report was read, giving the results of the mail ballot. The

following officers were elected for 1955:

Chairman, Jerome W. Archer, Marquette University

Associate Chairman, Irwin Griggs, Temple University

Assistant Chairman, Francis Shoemaker, Teachers College, Columbia University

Secretary (for a two-year term): Mrs. Gladys K. Brown, Little Rock Junior College

The following were elected to the Executive Committee for a three-year term:

Universities: Cecil Blue, Lincoln University (Missouri); William M. Gibson, New York University; Harrison Hayford, Northwestern University; Albert R.

¹ Secretary pro tem.

Kitzhaber, University of Kansas; Edith E. Layer, Western Reserve University; J. Hooper Wise, University of Florida.

Liberal Arts Colleges: Hermann Bowersox, Roosevelt College; Mrs. Mary White, Marshall College

Teachers Colleges: L. M. Myers, Arizona State College

Technical Schools: Erwin R. Steinberg, Carnegie Institute of Technology

Junior Colleges: Gilbert D. McEwen, Pasadena City College

(NOTE: As immediate past chairman of the CCCC, T. A. Barnhart, St. Cloud State Teachers College, becomes a member of the Executive Committee for one year.)

3. Treasurer J. N. Hook reported that

as of July 31, 1954, the balance in the treasury was \$1653.45.

4. Irwin Griggs announced plans for the 1955 Spring Meeting in Chicago (See Item 1 in Secretary's Report No. 12, above).

5. Jerome W. Archer, newly elected CCCC Chairman (for 1955), expressed the appreciation of the group for the services of T. A. Barnhart, retiring chairman, to CCCC during the past year and previous years.

6. The business meeting was adjourned, and was followed immediately by a panel discussion on the subject, "Status for the Teacher of the One Hundred Percent."

Some of the Year's Work in College Composition and Communication

As indicated occasionally in this column, the general purpose of this section is to call attention to articles in the fields of composition and communication appearing in various well known and not-so-well known periodicals. The plan does not include summarizing articles in our field published in *College English*, since all our members receive this publication; also, CCC does not summarize, usually, or mention articles which have been summarized in the "News and Ideas" section of *College English*, to which section your constant attention is advisable. Whenever material is summarized in both magazines, the reason is that copy is being prepared independently by the staffs of both magazines for an issue appearing at approximately the same time.

In "Motivation in Listening Training," *Journal of Communication*, Summer, 1954, Charles E. Irvin of Michigan State

College reaches the conclusion that self-interest is the best motivation in maintaining the interest which is essential to efficient listening. He lists "nine selfish, honest, simple, motivating answers to the question, Why am I listening?" In brief these answers are: to pass examinations, to converse more impressively, to improve personality, to choose a career wisely, to profit financially, to improve socially, to benefit culturally, to increase self-confidence, to acquire knowledge quickly. (JEAN MALMSTROM)

Paul Saettler, "Historical Overview of Audio-Visual Communication," *Audio-Visual Communication Review*, Spring, 1954, summarizes briefly the historical development of the subject under the following heads and subdivisions: Early Legacy; Visual Education (the school museum movement; university-extension movement; organization of visual-educational

tion bureaus in city public school systems; development of the non-theatrical film, and rise of commercial enterprises in visual education); Radio Education (experimental, developmental, transitional); Educational Television; and the Communications Movement (with its roots in the investigations of experts in social psychology, sociology, advertising, journalism, library science, radio, motion pictures, public opinion, reading, political science, propaganda, literary analysis, and anthropology).

Rensis Likert (University of Michigan), "A Neglected Factor in Communications," *Audio-Visual Communication Review*, Summer, 1954. Three conditions must be fulfilled for maximum results in any audio-visual undertaking: using the most appropriate media, using good technical skill in the utilization of the selected media, and using content that produces a sufficient impact upon a target audience to achieve the desired instructional objective. This article expands the last point by stressing that "many audio-visual materials would have doubled effectiveness if sample interview surveys were made prior to their production in an effort to learn what is in the psychological environment of the intended audience": their interests, needs, problems, objects, events, and similar factors.

J. D. Thomas (The Rice Institute), "Thwarting the Two-Day Term Report," *The Journal of Engineering Education*, October, 1954, includes the directions he gives to students for the investigative paper and a weekly schedule for ten weeks of assignments. In addition to learning of and correcting any errors in subject matter, method, and the like, the student through this plan must spend a due proportion of every week on the

preparation of the paper. An inflexible rule, "only one week's work may be performed in any week," is supplemented by three others: under no circumstances are two assignments accepted in one calendar week; no assignments may be skipped; nothing is received during the final week.

John T. Auston of Michigan State College in "Improving Everyday Speaking and Listening Efficiency," *Journal of Communication*, Summer, 1954, describes his department's "speech efficiency training" which "is in use in many places today, if only on a limited experimental basis . . . the principle has been in use for over twenty years as the ultimate test of instrument efficiency in telephone communication." At Michigan State College "the students . . . work . . . in teams of two, seated back-to-back, one reading a list of specially selected words, the other writing down what he hears, and then reversing the process with the original speaker becoming the writer and the original writer the speaker." This process makes it "possible to raise the sending-receiving efficiency of all students significantly in a few hours of supervised practice." (JEAN MALMSTROM)

As an answer to the question, "What Is 'Freshman English' in the Colleges and Universities of Indiana?" *Purdue English Notes* (February, 1954) has brief articles from twenty-three Indiana institutions, describing their programs. The generalizations from these twenty-three programs are as follows:

"Two or three institutions have introduced the newer programs where communication or communications (i.e., writing, reading, speaking, listening) are included as related units within the same course. Most programs, however, follow the 'traditional' pattern, which may mean

a number of things: remedial and then regular writing; writing and reading; composition and literature; adapted writing for specific purposes; writing and speech in different courses in different semesters; or other semester-combinations.

"Virtually every college has an orientation program (placement test and/or theme) in English. Where enrollment does not permit sectioning by ability, the orientation results are used in counseling and helping students who need remedial work. Where enrollment does permit, there are upper and lower divisions, or a low, middle, and high division.

"Adequate provision is made for the weak or poorly prepared freshman. At no cost to the student, he may be offered a review course (with or without credit, usually without) preparing him for the regular work. Or by meeting one or two extra hours a week, in connection with a regular or special course, he may be able to overcome his handicaps, receive credit, and advance with his classmates.

"Provision, also, is made, in general, for the superior or well prepared freshman. He may be put in a special 'advanced' freshman composition class carrying extra credit or he may be exempted from one or more of the required courses or be placed in second-semester or second-year classes. High school students who work hard in English courses can expect to find their hard work well rewarded when they reach college.

"The heart of the freshman English course is the writing. Inside-class (im-promptu) and outside-of-class papers are written regularly, and during the second semester, usually, there is a term or research paper, with emphasis on note-taking, organization, footnotes, and bibliography. But for all writing, in order to attain correct, clear, and effective expression (and speaking, too) assignments are made in grammar, punctuation, capitali-

zation, spelling, word choice and vocabulary, and dictionary use; also in choice of subject, outlining and organization, development, paragraph writing and development, sentence structure, and clear thinking.

"Reading assignments serve two purposes: as guides to writing (models and subject matter) and as a means of establishing enthusiasm for good reading. Essays and articles are generally used, but later in the semester or year some colleges include biography, a play, a novel, short stories, and poetry.

"The textbooks, usually, are a dictionary of college grade, a handbook, a book of readings, perhaps a workbook, perhaps a book of literature. Final examinations, where given, may include objective and essay questions, and invariably a written paper.

"Some colleges have follow-up plans in order to prevent students past the freshman year from relapsing into bad writing habits."

In "The Critical Importance of Communication in General Education," *Journal of Communication*, Fall, 1954, C. Merton Babcock of Michigan State College describes "how language study may be employed as a welding agent to synthesize the various content courses included in the liberal curriculum." This kind of synthesis "rests on a wholistic psychology of learning . . . the field theory as proposed by Kurt Levin and his followers . . . Human behavior is thought to be determined by a complex pattern of limiting and motivating factors in a total context of personality, society, and culture." If language study is to function as a synthesizing agent for the various content subjects of the liberal college, such study must be realistically and idealistically oriented. Basing his assertion on work of both the structural linguist and

the general semanticist, Babcock states his postulates in realistic-idealistic balance. He says, for instance, "Living American idioms should be preferred to literary diction, but the dignity of the English language should be consciously preserved," or "Functional varieties of English should replace arbitrarily defined levels of usage, but social responsibility should be made a criterion of effectiveness in communication," or "The multiple-semantic characteristic of words should be recognized, but verbal currency should not be so inflated as to render individual expressions 'meaningless,'" or "Emphasis should be placed upon specificity, but specific facts should be shown to have little value except as they are applied to recognized patterns."

(JEAN MALMSTROM)

Louis Foley, "Defenders of Grammatical Heresy," *The Phi Delta Kappan*, December, 1952, discusses the question raised when certain linguistic authorities occasionally make newspaper headlines by coming out in defense of something which every one has always been sure was not good English. His discussion and illustrations center on "ain't," and he concludes: "One wonders just what is the real purpose of the erudite professors who come out periodically in defense of linguistic barbarisms. Are they seeking to encourage more widespread use of such expressions? If so, their effort hardly seems necessary. Can it be that they think by removing prohibitions they may rob the objectionable words of their attractiveness, and thus indirectly bring about improvement? If they are really candid, there is perhaps no better reply than an argument *ad hominem*. What would be their attitude toward a colleague (if there were any!), or a student coming up for an advanced degree, who quite unself-consciously, with no im-

plied quotation marks, regularly used *ain't* as the typical *ain't*-user uses it, because that was the only way he could comfortably express himself?"

John B. Hoben, Director of English Communication, Colgate University, writes "English Communication at Colgate Re-examined" for the Fall, 1954, issue of *Journal of Communication*. June, 1954, marked the fifth year of operation for English Communication at Colgate as "the specific course in Colgate's general education curriculum which is aimed at the improvement of the student's ability to communicate information and ideas." This one-term course is offered at the sophomore level, is "non-departmental in character and administered by one who is responsible to the Director of University Studies." The course defines communication as "the verbal exchange of thought or idea." Though listening and reading are not neglected, the course's major emphasis is on speaking and reading which are presented "as interrelated modes, rather than as distinct skills to be studied in separate blocks of the course." The mass media were chosen as a content field rather than permitting students to choose from a wide, unrelated range of topics ("as is often done in speech and composition courses") or to select subject matter from other university courses. By correlating practice in the skills of communication with an extensive study of the mass media the student was expected to acquire an intelligent understanding of his cultural heritage as he acquired facility in English expression and an understanding of the total communication process. After early experiments with short subscriptions to magazines and newspapers, imported lecturers, and special films, English Communication at Colgate now uses Briggs' *Language . . . Man . . . Society* and

Dean's *Effective Communication*, the opaque projector, and the wire recorder with satisfactory results. (JEAN MALMSTROM)

In "Auditory Functions and Abilities in Good and Poor Listening," *Journal of Communication*, Fall, 1954, Stanley Ainsworth, Chairman of Speech Correction, University of Georgia, and Charles High, Chairman, Speech Correction Department, Dade County Schools, Miami, Florida, report on an experiment to determine the validity of the hypothesis that "although speech may be detected normally, the content of the speech may not be comprehended or recalled because of confusion introduced by inadequacy in discriminating differences in pitch, loudness, time, quality or rhythm, or by insufficient ability to detect differences between speech sounds." The results of the study indicate that specific and separate auditory abilities are not related to listening ability as measured by immediate recall tests. Although these auditory abilities may be improved with practice, there is no reason to believe that such an improvement would increase listening comprehension. (JEAN MALMSTROM)

C. Merton Babcock, "A Rationale for Communication Skills," *School and Society*, July 11, 1953: "The purposes of the present paper are to trace the development of an empirical attitude toward language employment, and to relate significant tenets of social, linguistic, and psychological theory to such development . . . The 19th-century doctrine of usage may properly be called an initial revolt against linguistic authoritarianism . . . A relativistic, functional, and dynamic theory of language began to replace the puristic, dogmatic, and arbitrary acceptance of rules and restraints . . . Com-

munication skill is characterized by honesty and sincerity of expression, clarity and specificity of thought, importance and significance of ideas, appropriateness of diction, centralization of purpose, logical organization of materials, and consistency of development. Effectiveness of expression, in short, is preferred to 'correctness' of expression. An effective communicator is aware of the dynamic potentialities of language, of its social qualities, of its fluid nature, of its deceptive characteristics, and of its therapeutic values." The last half of the article summarizes the contributions to communication of cultural anthropology, linguistic science, field theory ("that individuals must be considered as organisms-as-a-whole-in-an-environment"), and general semantics. "Additional contributions to communication have been variously made by studies in student-centered curricula, socialized instruction, nondirective counseling, group dynamics, agreement and co-operation, analysis of propaganda and opinion, mass media of communication, speech pathology, occupational orientation, psychodrama, socio-drama, subject-matter integration, and transfer of training."

In "Remedial Writing Programs" (*School and Society*, September 19, 1953), Ina Hunter Unglesby, of Louisiana State University, summarizes the results of her visits to twenty-one Midwestern, eastern, and southern colleges and universities in order to observe their remedial writing agencies—especially as these concern upperclass students deficient in writing ability. The author briefly describes the following: the staff which tests and teaches writing proficiency; general and specific facilities; methods of discovery and diagnosis; administration of tests; programs of study; kind and number of students who receive

aid; results of the writing-proficiency program; the part that grade and high schools, the freshman English program, and non-English university staff members could have in the improvement of student proficiency in writing.

James B. McMillan, University of Alabama, "A Dictionary as a Guide to Usage," *Inside the ACD*, September, 1953. (Abstract.) We turn to a dictionary when we read or hear an unfamiliar word or usage from someone else, or when we want to know how to use a word to communicate with other people whose language or writing situation may be different from our own . . . Good modern dictionaries are characterized by a large number of usage labels which indicate regional, subject, social, and other limitations on words, grammar, and meanings . . . The labels enable us (1) to understand the special language of people whose linguistic habits are different from ours, and (2) to edit our own language to communicate with people in groups different from ours, or with familiar people on special occasions. Restrictive labels are of three main kinds: geographical [like *Brit.*, *Scot.*, *U. S.*, and *New England*, marking words or senses of regional currency], subject [like *Sociol.*, *Eccles.*, and *Zool.*, indicating professions or occupations], and functional [like *Slang*, *Colloq.*, *Dial.*, *Archaic*, and *Poetic*] . . . The theory of functional labels is easy to state: it is that certain words and senses are characteristic of certain situations, contexts, or people . . . Modern dictionaries accept the assumption of scientific linguistics that when there are two common ways of saying something, one is not "right" and the other "wrong," but one is sometimes appropriate and the other is *sometimes* appropriate, depending on the time, place, subject, speaker (or writer) and audience . . . Good mod-

ern dictionaries, which are revised frequently to keep up with changes in language, base their decisions about usage on the actual, observed practice of educated native users of the language (not on logic, mystical grammar, etymology, personal preferences, or older dictionaries). The editors read constantly in books, magazines, newspapers, and other writings, and listen to speeches, sermons, lectures, conversations, and other kinds of talks, noting changes in the orbits of expressions and collecting facts to report in dictionaries . . . The good lexicographer handles the slipperiness and complexity of usage by carefully keeping track of the occurrences of words and grammatical features, and by using labels which are general and flexible . . . The intelligent user of a good dictionary, remembering the very difficult job of the lexicographer, the reportorial nature of his words and grammatical features, and by labels and exclusion policy, uses the dictionary as a guide, not as a bible. The enlightened user expects the dictionary to inform him how particular words were regarded in distant places and in unfamiliar contexts when it was published, and he accepts the lexicographer's advice to supplement the dictionary by watching usage himself.

Helmut E. Gerber, "The Writing Business or Business Writing?" in *Collegiate News and Views*, October, 1953, expresses the attitude that business English training is not nearly so important as basic training in English composition; that as far as the format of the business letter is concerned an average student can absorb everything there is to know in less than two hours. The rest is just plain writing, nothing but unmodified old-fashioned English, i.e., rhetoric (grammar, syntax, or whatever the individual prefers to call it), diction, espe-

cially avoidance of faulty diction and hackneyed phrases), style, and tone; and these matters concern all writing, whether it is about business or anything else. Also, wide reading in the literature of our time, both creative and expository, is still the best way to absorb the richness of our language.

Charles H. Nichols, of Hampton Institute, Virginia, in "The War Against 'Bonehead Grammar'" (*School and Society*, October 17, 1953), is pessimistic about any permanent value received from proficiency tests given in the upperclass years with further training for those found deficient—and this pessimism is in spite of the fact that Hampton has what the author believes is one of the most effective programs he has seen, with an excellent Communications Center for the required work, numerous audio-visual aids, English orientation for freshmen, remedial sections, check-ups on English by every faculty member, and passing an upper-class proficiency test in English as a requirement for graduation. The author is pessimistic because all this remedial work comes too late in a student's life; his patterns of writing and speaking are thoroughly established by the time he is seventeen years old, and though his knowledge of style and form can be refined in college, his grasp of the fundamentals of grammatical structure, spelling, and syntax does not measurably improve. Many of the students who take remedial freshman English are dropped from college (perhaps 90 percent) for generally poor scholarship before the junior year; those who remain repeatedly take the proficiency examination and repeatedly fail "until members of the English department, cajoled and pleaded with by parents, or persuaded by college officials, allow the illiterates to pass so that they can graduate and spare us the

further ordeal of reading their garbled English." Two solutions are proposed: (1) more selective admission of students to college and (2) "it is high time the legislatures and school boards of the nation provided the money and personnel necessary for the effective teaching of English in the elementary and secondary schools."

By Betty Barbour (Catawba College), in *North Carolina English Teacher*, December, 1953, "Here Come the Freshmen." End of summer: English teacher—registration—the students: the tall commuting day-student who isn't interested in anything and takes the least objectionable courses and hours; the girl who knows what courses she wants and when and where; the bright girl who wants to take English, biology, history, Spanish, religion, and Greek; the high school football hero with his schedule of easy classes and easier instructors already made out by the coach; the future veterinarian genuinely interested in his future; the girl whose main interest is males and who changes her major from sociology to English because sociology comes at twelve o'clock on Tuesday, Thursday, and Saturday . . . June: the football hero has passed English thanks to the bright girl, whose reward is an engagement ring; the veterinarian-to-be has withdrawn; the English major prepares for a re-examination in Freshman English. Day-dreaming: "Perhaps working with capricious, incalculable, sometimes heart-breakingly unresponsive youth is more interesting than with predictable clay or marble."

John D. Byrd, *The Florida Newsletter*, October, 1953, in "Freshman English at Florida Southern," describes the program at his college. *Aims*: intelligent reading for gathering and examination of ideas

and for esthetic pleasure; oral and written expression which is clear, correct, graceful; full and effective use of the library, and writing satisfactory research papers. *Curriculum*: vocabulary-building—through use of the words encountered in reading; reading—voluntary outside class with required written and oral reports, and assigned in the class-text (*College English: The First Year*), with exercises and tests in comprehension, reading rate, and summarizing; grammar—studied as an essential aid to correctness and effectiveness of composition; composition—from paragraphs to short essays with attention to paragraph-linkings, and from narrative to expository to discussion. Organization is stressed throughout, as it is in oral composition in the too-brief time allowed for practice in speech-making. *Special tests*: at entrance in vocabulary, reading comprehension, and essay-writing. Exceptional proficiency in these qualifies a student for a further test by which he may be exempted from the first and even the second semester of freshman English. At the end of the freshman course, a more detailed test is given, and students receiving a grade below C must take another semester of freshman English.

The Professional Standards Committee of the Virginia Association of Teachers of English, after considering the opinions of people engaged in training teachers of English, the opinions of English teachers and teachers' groups in secondary schools, and the professional literature on the subject, recommends the following as requirements for a secondary school certificate in the teaching of English in Virginia: I. English fundamentals and the communication skills of reading, writing, speaking, and listening, 6 semester hours; II. English literature, with emphasis on the personal and social exper-

ience and the ethical and aesthetic values found in the literature itself, 6 semester hours; III. American literature, with some attention to contemporary as well as traditional writings, 3 semester hours; IV. History and description of the English language: sounds, forms, grammar, syntax, vocabulary, 3 semester hours. These are *only* basic; it is hoped that most teachers seeking certification will have the full 30 or more semester hours required for an English major in college, and that the Virginia requirement can be raised from 18 to 24 semester hours in English, in order to include additional study in advanced composition, language, speech, modern literature, Shakespeare, world literature, and literary criticism.—*The Virginia English Bulletin*, December, 1953.

"An Exercise in the Acknowledgment of Sources," by Katherine Burton (Wheaton College), *The Exercise Exchange*, Volume II, No. 1, describes a project in freshman composition for students who have not yet undertaken a source theme. Material: last sentence of Lincoln's "Gettysburg Address." Process in class: (1) duplicated slips handed out containing sentence; (2) discussion of importance of quoting exactly, and definition of paraphrasing; (3) students write own paraphrases and read them aloud; (4) particular points isolated, using Lincoln's own words, and discussion of relevancy and difference between "said" and "implied"; (5) students make single points in their own words; (6) students write a completely independent comment on the passage for the next class hour, and subordinate any quotation or paraphrase to their own thought. Comparison of two student-written passages brought up "such questions as whether the speech was, in fact, well received, whether the war was over at the

time the speech was made, what the occasion was, who was there (whether there had been special arrangements to bring relatives of those who had died there), etc. We didn't try to answer most of these questions, but left the matter at the general realization that to write even this short comment on a short familiar passage as well as possible would take some research, that it would easily grow into a miniature source theme, that most academic work does, that this is why the source theme techniques are so much emphasized in freshman English."

"Group Dynamics—What Is It?" by Russell L. Jenkins, Michigan State College, *Basic College Newsletter*, January, 1954. "Group dynamics is related, as the term implies, to changes which take place among people who operate as a group Group dynamics is essentially an area of study and research in social science, wherein the interactions and reactions of individuals in the group are studied experimentally. Data collected from such groups are then treated scientifically." Although some sessions for group improvement and development of leadership skills may collect, analyze and study information and data, and thus make a contribution to group dynamics, other kinds of group discussions where there is no structure for discussion are not group dynamics. But classroom groups and other discussion groups studying themselves for individual and group improvement are essentially in the area of group dynamics, even though the data and information are not subjected to scientific analysis. There is, then, a difference between "(1) group dynamics as experimental research involving social science theory, and (2) group dynamics as a self-study approach to more effective skills in group operation." But "group dynamics" is a term

improperly used in connection with leadership and membership training when the applied approach to improvement of skills for more effective group operation is only a technique, a procedure, or an uncontrolled discussion.

"The Reading Improvement Service," January, 1954, *Basic College Newsletter*, Michigan State College. This service, described by its staff, is utilized by students who enroll voluntarily: self-referrals, those referred by the Counseling Center, and those referred by enrollment officers and instructors. The purpose or emphasis is the development of effective reading skills as they apply to the study situation, especially in overcoming a lack of power of concentration. General procedure includes: (1) The establishment of a detailed weekly study schedule; (2) Developing the habit of practicing recall in the study situation; (3) Developing a sense of word consciousness, with students encouraged to note all unfamiliar terms, guess the meaning of the term from context, and then check the dictionary meaning to confirm the contextual meaning; (4) Developing the habit of expressing in one's own language the ideas presented. Used in the work are special exercises in skimming, in adjusting reading rate to purpose, in vocabulary, in sentence reading; used also are comprehension drills in directions and reading selections.

Donald E. Hayden (University of Tulsa), "Semantics in Action," *The CEA Critic*, February, 1954, describes the kind of technique being used more and more widely in discussion groups throughout the country. Participants were employees of industrial firms meeting an hour each day for four days, in groups of twenty or thirty; discussion leaders came

from various universities; the program was called "Let's Talk It Over." To improve communication, to help toward mutual understanding and often agreement, some of the following semantic principles were used: as many as possible of the principles of "Group Dynamics"; careful *listening* by both leader and participants; "play-back" technique or restating comments with the added question, "Is that what you mean?"; awareness of the abstraction process with the next necessary step of coming down the abstraction ladder to lower levels; importance of context in determining meaning; distinguishing between reports and judgments, between "facts" and "opinions."

Paul Roberts (San Jose State College), "The Future of Grammar," *Inside the ACD*, February, 1954. For several decades linguists have been in revolt against two assumptions underlying traditional ways of teaching English: "(1) that there are absolute criteria—logical, analogical, etymological, or whatever—by which correctness can be measured; and (2) that there are universal, nonlinguistic concepts through which the linguistic categories of any language can be identified and defined." Ultimately the revolt will succeed, since science is on the side of linguistics and structural analysis. What are the effects on English teaching likely to be? "Correctness is altogether relative, having nothing to do with logic or the order of the universe, but depending on such variables as time, place, circumstance, age, sex . . . All this is old stuff . . . But the implications for classroom procedure are still to be understood and faced. One thing that the idea of relativity does not mean is that it doesn't matter how we talk or write . . . Certainly it matters how you say a thing. Saying the right thing in the

wrong way may get you fired, divorced, arrested, or expelled from the P.T.A. . . . It makes a tremendous difference how you say a thing; it just doesn't always make the same difference. In fact, it probably never makes the same difference twice." Nor can difficulties that arise be met with the concept of "levels of usage," dividing usage into the usual three—standard, colloquial, vulgate; for this concept has led us, not to be descriptive, but to be prescriptive in a more complicated way. The alternative is to abandon prescription in usage patterns entirely, and aim, not at conformity, but at range, flexibility, adaptability. The result will be "a major improvement in the morale of English classes and in a general rise in the ability to speak and write fluently, intelligibly, gracefully, accurately, and even—in the best sense of the word—correctly." Along with this must go a revolution in our techniques of describing language, replacing the superstition of "universal grammar," resting on the grammar of Latin, by a new grammar which, by our understanding of tangible, real, and rather interesting structural signals, will really make sense. Whether we save as much as possible from tradition or begin again in our looking at the language, seeing what's there and finding ways of describing it, "the grammar that emerges will make English studies more pleasant than they are now. People are disposed to believe that traditional grammar is dull and difficult, but useful. As generally taught, grammar is difficult and dull, but it isn't useful. The new grammar may not be useful either, and will be difficult, but won't be dull."

Irving Lorge and Lorraine Kruglov Diamond (Teachers College, Columbia University), in "The English Proficiency of Foreign Students, Judged by the Rec-

ords of Students with Different Linguistic Backgrounds," *Journal of Higher Education*, January, 1954. This article is a condensation of three manuscripts, and the authors will be pleased to provide more information for those desiring it. Evidence is presented concerning two questions: (1) Are there particular aspects of English usage which are more or less difficult for all foreign students, or for certain groups of them? (2) Are foreign students favored on English vocabulary tests which contain words etymologically related to their own vernacular? The answers in brief are: (1) "Each language group has its own areas of strength and weakness." (2) "The evidence demonstrates bias for and against students of different linguistic groups. The bias favors students with a native language related to the tested words, or with educational language experiences related to the tested words."

Meredith N. Posey (East Carolina College), in "A Diatribe on Diagrammar," *North Carolina English Teacher*, February, 1954, is opposed to diagramming. He believes "the way to see the real value of diagrammar is to diagram a sentence, take away the words, and view the resulting elegant doodle and see how informing it is! And to this notion must be added the fact that the sentence could not have been diagrammed without pre-existing knowledge of the grammar involved. The student does not understand the grammar because of the diagram, but understands the diagram because of the grammar he already understands. Thus the professor of diagrammar requires the student to understand grammar and in addition diagramming. . . . The keys to grammatical knowledge are form (morphology) and meaning (syntax and semantics)—not lines and

curves." On the other hand, the author believes that parsing is good drill in grammar, for it tests understanding and memory for grammatical facts. Also, grammatical terminology is necessary, just as terminology is necessary in any other body of knowledge. "Names are necessary for forms and functions of words or larger elements in sentences. Otherwise, we could never render an account of the anatomy and functioning of language."

Those who teach English as a foreign language will find useful advice and suggestions in "Ingles Vivo (Live English)," by Robert S. Whitehouse (University of Miami), *Association of American Colleges Bulletin*, October, 1954. These suggestions result from the author's experience in teaching English for six years in Cuba, and, more recently, at the University of the Valley of the Cauca in Colombia, with the attendant difficulties that had to be overcome.

Karl W. Dykema (Youngstown College), in a review, "Webster's New World Dictionary, College Edition," *American Speech*, February, 1954, gives a comparative study, through judicious samplings of significant kinds of information, of four desk dictionaries: the one reviewed, *The American College Dictionary*, Funk and Wagnalls *New College Standard Dictionary*, and Webster's *New Collegiate Dictionary*. Materials sampled and used for comparison are: illustrations, pronunciation, usage, inclusion of puzzling words from current reading, definitions, etymologies, various sorts of encyclopedic information, and editorial staffs. The review is built upon answers to two questions: "Who uses a dictionary? And what for?"

Proposed Revisions of the CCCC Constitution

NOTE 1. The Committee for the Revision of the Constitution (Chairman, Jerome W. Archer, Beverly E. Fisher, J. N. Hook, and Robert E. Tuttle) presented the following revisions to the CCCC Executive Committee in Detroit on November 25. They were unanimously approved. In accordance with the present Constitution (Article IX, Section 1), "Previous notice of a proposal to amend this constitution must be made (a) at the preceding meeting, or (b) by mail or in the official periodical at least thirty days prior to the submission of the ballot," the proposed revisions are herewith printed for the information of the membership.

NOTE 2. For the present Constitution, refer to the copy printed in CCC, III, October, 1952, 19-24 (and reprinted in CCCC Facts), and to the printed copy of the Amendments in CCC, IV, May, 1953, 54-56; for the adoption of the Amendments, see Secretary's Report No. 9, in CCC, V, February, 1954, p. 40.

ARTICLE II to be amended as follows:

Section 1. There shall be three types of membership: individual, institutional-sustaining, and non-voting associate.

Section 2. Individual membership shall be open to any member of the NCTE who is interested in any phase or area of college composition and communication.

Section 3. Institutional-sustaining membership shall be open to any educational institution upon the request of one of its members (such as the chairman or director of composition or communication) who is also a member of the NCTE.

Section 4. Non-voting associate membership shall be open to any member of the Speech Association of America who is interested in any phase or area of college composition and communication.

Reason: The present amendment allows full membership to any member of the Speech Association of America. The CCCC Executive Committee approved only associate membership for SAA members, not full membership (see CCC, May 1953, pp. 53-54). If full membership, without membership in the NCTE, is granted to SAA members, should it not also be granted to MLA members or CEA members? The special privilege given to SAA members should not in-

clude the right to vote in the organization.

ARTICLE III to be amended as follows:

A new item, Section 2, to read:

Section 2. The term of all officers shall commence thirty days after the announcement of their election, which announcement shall be made at the annual business meeting held during the annual convention of the NCTE next following the return and counting of the ballots.

Reason: Article III as amended in 1953 (see second amendment, CCC, May, 1953, p. 55) provides that the officers shall begin to hold office thirty days after election. The Constitution does not define when election takes place (when the ballots are counted by the secretary, or when the secretary announces the ballots, or at the annual business meeting following the election by mail ballot?). In order to facilitate the work of the next year's Nominating Committee (cf. third amendment to the Constitution, in CCC, May, 1953, p. 55), it is probably best to regard the election as taking place upon the announcement by the secretary at the annual (Thanksgiving) business meeting. Holding of office will not begin, therefore (see second amendment, CCC, May, 1953, p. 55), until thirty days after this announcement.

Thus, the officers elected in the 1955 election will begin to hold office about December 25, 1955. The newly elected chairman, about December 25, or shortly thereafter, will appoint two members of CCCC to the Nominating Committee who along with the last three chairmen of the CCCC shall constitute the 1956 Nominating Committee (See CCC, May, 1953, p. 55). This committee will therefore have from about January 1, 1956, to about May 1, 1956, at the latest to draw up their slate of candidates, and will thus have the Spring 1956 meeting also as a time for group study and conference for purposes of drawing up their slate.

Present Section 2 (as amended; see CCC, May, 1953, p. 55) to become Section 3; and to have deleted from it "beginning thirty days after their election."

Present Section 3 to become Section 4; and to have deleted from it "beginning thirty days after his election."

Present Sections 4 to 7 to become Sections 5 to 8.

Reason: Consequent upon changes recommended for ARTICLE III, Section 2. (new item), above.

ARTICLE IV to be amended as follows:

COMMITTEES

Section 1: *The Executive Committee*

- a. There shall be an Executive Committee consisting of twenty-five to thirty members, exclusive of the ex-officio members later to be enumerated.
- b. So far as practicable, membership of the Committee shall be evenly distributed geographically, and among universities, liberal arts colleges, teachers colleges, junior colleges, and technical schools.
- c. Members of the Committee shall hold office for three years. However, the first general election to office shall be such that one-third of the membership shall be elected for a term of one year, one-third for two years, and one-third for three years. Each year thereafter the retiring members shall be replaced by elections, as specified in Article VII.
- d. No member of the Committee shall be eligible to re-election to the Committee in the year in which he retires.
- e. The term of a member shall regularly begin thirty days after the announcement of election, which announcement shall be made at the annual business meeting held during the annual convention of the NCTE next following his election.
- f. Nomination, election, and filling of vacancies shall be as specified in Article VII.
- g. As present "d."
- h. As present "e."
- i. As present "f."
- j. As present "b," but omit "(See f. below)."
- k. As present "g."

Reason: In general, the change in form and order is to insure that only one point is handled in a single clause and to look more logical. Also see *Reason* above, under Article III.

ARTICLE VII to be amended as follows:
Section 2. d. to read:

Present the slate of candidates to the secretary by the May 1st following the date on which the Committee was appointed.

Reason: See 3rd Amendment, CCC, May, 1953, p. 55.

Section 3. to read as follows:

It shall be the policy to elect officers and new members of the Executive Committee by a mail ballot, to be sent out no later than October 1 of each year, adequate provision to be made for announcing the names of the candidates, providing the writing in of additional names, and allowing reasonable time (at least thirty days) for the return of the ballots.

Present Section 5 to be deleted.

Present Section 6 to be numbered Section 5. Present Section 7 to be numbered Section 6, and to be revised by deletion of the words "business meeting" (both occurrences) and the substitution therefor of the word "election" (twice).

Reason: It is felt that mail ballots for elections are more likely to reflect the will of the majority of the membership than are ballots at the annual business meeting: cf. discussion under 3rd Amendment, CCC, May, 1953, p. 55.

ARTICLE IX to be amended as follows:

Section 1: Delete the words "(a) at the preceding meeting, or (b)."

Section 2: Delete the words "if made."

Section 3: Delete this section.

Section 4: Change the number of this section to Section 3.

Reason: To make the Constitution consistent with previous amendments and with the recommended revisions.

BY-LAWS to be amended as follows:

1. Dues to have a new item:

C. Dues for an associate membership shall be \$2.00 (to be accepted upon proper proof of membership in SAA).

2 D. (1): Delete the words "his successor is elected" and substitute the words "The election of his successor is announced."

2 D. (3): Delete the last "and," and substitute a comma; delete the period, and substitute a comma, and add: "and, at the annual business meeting, announce their election." (cf. Article III, Section 2, and Article IV, Section 1. e.).

2 D. (6): Delete the comma, and add the words "and the counting thereof."

Reason: To make the Constitution more specific and also consistent with previous amendments and with the recommended revisions.

and
ttee
han
sion
of
of
able
urn

n 5.
n 6,
rds
and
tec-

for
will
are
cf.
CC,

vs:
the

,
ec-
on-
ith

hip
per

sor
che
uc-

ub-
er-
nd
si-
eir
ec-
on

the
re-

ore
us
re-